

The Gazette of India



PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

No. 51 NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 21, 1963/AGRAHAYANA 30, 1885

NOTICE

The undermentioned Gazettes of India Extraordinary were published upto the 10th December, 1963 :—

Issue	No. and Date	Issued by	Subject
245	S.O. 3395, dated 3rd December, 1963.	Ministry of International Trade.	Declaring certain machines as Essential Commodities.
	S.O. 3396, dated 3rd December, 1963.	Do.	The Textiles (Production by Knitting, Embroidery, Lace making and Printing Machines) Control Order, 1963.
246	S.O. 3397, dated 3rd December, 1963.	Election Commission, India.	List of Contesting Candidates in the Bye-election to the House of the People from the 34-Burdwan Parliamentary Constituency.
247	S.O. 3398, dated 9th December, 1963.	Do.	Calling upon the Nasik Parliamentary Constituency to elect a person to fill the vacancy in the House of the People by reason of the death of Shri Govind Hari Deshpande.
	S.O. 3399, dated 9th December, 1963.	Do.	Appointing dates etc. for the bye-election referred to in S.O. 3398 above.
	S.O. 3400, dated 9th December, 1963.	Do.	Fixation of hours with reference to the bye-election referred to in S.O. 3398 above.
248	S.O. 3401, dated 9th December, 1963.	Ministry of Labour and Employment.	Specifying the Labour Commissioner, Orissa, to be the Iron Ore Mines Cess Commissioner in the State of Orissa.
249	S.O. 3402, dated 9th December, 1963.	Election Commission, India.	List of Contesting Candidates in the Bye-election to the House of the People from No. 1, Cooch Behar (S. C.) Constituency.

Issue No.	No. and Date	Issued by	Subject
250	S.O. 3403, dated 9th December, 1963.	Ministry of Home Affairs.	Appointing a Commission of Enquiry consisting of Shri P. P. R. Sawhney, District and Sessions Judge of Delhi to inquire into the circumstances relating to the removal of two students of Tibbia College by the Police etc.
251	S.O. 3477, dated 10th December, 1963.	Ministry of Information and Broadcasting.	Approval of films specified therein.

Copies of the Gazettes Extraordinary mentioned above will be supplied on indent to the Manager of Publications, Civil Lines, Delhi. Indents should be submitted so as to reach the Manager within ten days of the date of issue of these Gazettes.

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than the Ministry of Defence) and by Central Authorities (other than the Administrations of Union Territories).

ELECTION COMMISSION, INDIA

New Delhi, the 10th December 1963

S.O. 3486.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 22 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, the Election Commission hereby directs that the following amendment shall be made in its notification No. 434/GJ/61, dated the 21st October, 1961, namely:—

In the Table appended to the said notification, for the entries in column 3 against item 14, the following entries shall be substituted, namely:—

1. Resident Deputy Collector, Kaira.
2. Prant Officer, Dholka Prant, Dholka.
3. Prant Officer, Petlad Prant, Petlad.
4. Special Land Acquisition Officer, Kaira."

[No. 434/GJ/63.]

New Delhi, the 11th December 1963

S.O. 3487.—In pursuance of section 106 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, the Election Commission hereby publishes the order pronounced on the 8th November, 1963 by the Election Tribunal, Patiala in Election Petition No. 262 of 1962.

BEFORE SHRI MURARI LAL PURI, ELECTION TRIBUNAL, PATTIALA

E. P. No. 262 of 1962

Decided on 8th November, 1963

Petitioner: Pritam Singh son of Kishen Singh, Village Deh Kalan Tahsil and District Sangrur, Punjab State.

Versus

Respondents: 1. S. Ranjit Singh s/o R. B. Narain Singh, Narain Cottage, Sangrur.

2. S. Dalip Singh, s/o Attar Singh, Railway Road, Nabha.

3. S. Parkash Singh, s/o Bachan Singh, village Nirheri, P.O. Shadalwad, Tahsil Malerkotla, District Sangrur.
4. Shri Purshotam Lal, s/o Walaiti Ram, Dhuri, District Sangrur.
5. S. Wazir Singh Jeji, s/o S. Harchand Singh Jeji, Ward No. 4, 3 Bridges, Simla.
6. S. Ujagar Singh, S/o Shyam Singh, village & P.O. Chuck Bhai Kot, Tahsil Barnala, District Sangrur.

Petition u/s 81 and 84 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, for declaring the election of Shri Ranjit Singh, respondent No. 1, as void and further the petitioner may be declared to have been duly elected.

PRESENT:

Shri Muni Lal Kalia, Advocate.—*for the Petitioner.*

Shri D. K. Puri, Advocate.—*for Respondent No. 1.*

JUDGMENT

1. This petition, under Section 81 of the Representation of the People Act, calls in question the election of Shri Ranjit Singh, respondent No. 1, to the House of People from Sangrur Parliamentary constituency. The result was declared on 26th February 1962 and while the petitioner lost, respondent No. 1 was declared as duly elected.

2. The grounds on which the election has been challenged are as below:—

- (i) The nomination papers of Shri Wazir Singh Jeji, respondent No. 5 were improperly rejected by the Returning Officer at the time of scrutiny on 29th January, 1962.
- (ii) The nomination papers of Shri Ujagar Singh, respondent No. 6 were improperly rejected at the time of scrutiny, on the date mentioned above; and
- (iii) Respondent No. 1 committed the corrupt practice of making an appeal to the religious sentiments of the voters of Sikh and Hindu community and asked them to vote for him.

The petition says that there was nothing wrong with the nomination papers and all necessary particulars had been given and that the Returning Officer quite improperly and illegally rejected them.

3. The allegations were denied in the written statement filed by the respondent and several objections were raised and all this gave rise to the following issues:—

1. Were the nomination papers of Respondent No. 5, Sh. Wazir Singh Jeji wrongly rejected by the Returning Officer and the same has materially affected the result of the election. As such the election of Respondent No. 1, the returned candidate is void? O.P.
2. Was the nomination paper of Respondent No. 6 Shri Ujjagar Singh, wrongly rejected by the Returning Officer and the same has materially affected the result of the election and hence the election of respondent No. 1 the returned candidate is void? O.P.
3. Did respondent No. 1 make an appeal to the religious sentiments of the voters of Sikh and Hindu Community of his Constituency, in the manner as alleged in para 27 of this petition and he asked them to vote for him and in this way he committed an act of corrupt practice in the course of his election campaign from 1st February 1962 to 24th February 1962. Hence the result of election has been materially affected and the election of Respondent No. 1 is void on that score? O.P.
4. In case the election of Respondent No. 1 be declared void, is the Petitioner entitled to a declaration that he stands duly elected, in the said election, to the Lok Sabha Constituency in question? O.P.
5. Has the petitioner failed to comply with the requirements of Section 81(3) of the Representation of the People Act, in the manner as alleged in para 'A' of Parliamentary objections mentioned in the written statement of respondent No. 1 and as such the petition is liable to dismissal? O.R.

6. Have respondents No. 5 and 6 been wrongly impleaded as party to this petition and if so, is the petition liable to dismissal on that score? O.R.
7. Has the petition not been signed and verified according to law, as alleged in para 'C' of the preliminary objections mentioned in the written statement and it is, therefore, liable to dismissal on that score? O.R.
8. Does the petition suffer from the defects mentioned in paras 'D' and 'E' of the preliminary objections referred to above and is hence liable to dismissal on that score? O.R.
9. Has the petitioner not given full particulars of the corrupt practice alleged in the petition and hence the petition is liable to dismissal? O.R.
10. Is the petitioner estopped from raising objection regarding the improper rejection of nomination papers of Shri Wazir Singh Jeji respondent as alleged in para 34 of the written statement? O.R.
11. Has the petitioner failed to comply with the provisions contained in Sections 81(3), 82, 83(1)(c), 83(1) Proviso and Section 83(2) of the Representation of the People Act as alleged in para (G) of the preliminary objections mentioned in the written statement and consequently this petition has no entity under Section 81 of the said Act and should, consequently, be dismissed? O.R.

4. Issues Nos. 5, 6, 7, 8 and 11 were decided (decision recorded against the respondent) vide the detailed order of this Tribunal dated 31st May 1963. Issue No. 9 was also disposed of by the same order inasmuch as petitioner gave a statement that he was giving up the allegations of corrupt practice which were the subject matter of issue No. 3 and regarding which this issue No. 9 has been framed. Issues Nos. 3 and 9 both were consequently dropped (being redundant under the circumstances).

5. On rest of the issues oral as well as documentary evidence has been produced by each party. Witnesses examined by the petitioner are Shri Harbans Singh, Naib Tahsildar Election, Sangrur (P.W. 1), Shri Hardial Singh, Advocate (P.W. 2), Shri Wazir Singh Jeji (P.W. 3), petitioner (S. Pritam Singh) himself as P.W. 4 and Shri Santokh Singh (P.W. 5). Witnesses examined by the respondent are Shri Nirbhai Singh (R.W. 1), Shri Birinder Singh (R.W. 2), Shri Maharaj Kishen, Election Qanungo (R.W. 3), Shri Harichand, Election Qanungo, Simla (R.W. 4) and Shri Ranjit Singh, respondent No. 1, as his own witness as R.W. 5.

6. No decision need be recorded on issue No. 4 inasmuch as petitioner's counsel is found to have deleted this matter from the prayer clause of the petition vide amendment made by him in the original petition on 6th June 1963. This issue is, consequently, dropped. We are hence concerned now with issues 1, 2 and 10 only.

'Issue No. 1.'

7. This issue concerns the nomination papers of Shri Wazir Singh Jeji which were three in number and which stand marked Ex. PW2/3 (Serial No. 11), Ex. PW3/B (Serial No. 14) and PW2/2 (Serial No. 15). As already noted all the three nomination papers were rejected by the Returning Officer. The order of rejection regarding Ex. PW2/3 (Paper No. 11) reads as below:

"Rejected because the name of the Parliamentary Constituency and the name of the village and the Assembly constituency and the Part No. of electoral roll of the candidate is not mentioned. Also the name of Parliamentary constituency of the proposer is not given. Signed Returning Officer"

As regards the other two nomination papers (Nos. 14 and 15), the objection (raised by the other candidates or their agents) which prevailed with the Returning Officer was that none of them was accompanied by either a copy of the electoral roll (of the constituency in which the name of Shri Wazir Singh Jeji, the candidate, stood entered as a voter) or of the relevant part thereof or a certified copy of the relevant entries in such roll and hence those nomination papers were liable to rejection. It may be noted here that Shri Wazir Singh had appended a copy of the electoral roll (copy of the relevant entries only) with his nomination paper No. 11 only and with none other. A note had, however, been given on nomination paper No. 14 that the copy of the electoral roll had duly been appended with nomination paper No. 11, no such note existed on nomination paper No. 15. The Returning Officer took the view that each nomination paper was a separate entity and according to law, on the point, a copy of the electoral roll or of the relevant part thereof or a certified copy of the relevant entries in that roll was necessary

to be filed with each nomination paper and since that had not been done, papers at No. 14 and 15 were liable to rejection. This view of the learned Returning Officer is being challenged by learned counsel for petitioner before me and his contention is that the Returning Officer ought not to have ignored the copy of the electoral roll which was at that very time before him when he held the scrutiny of nomination paper No. 11. Learned counsel is of the view that even though nomination paper No. 11 had been rejected, the electoral roll that stood appended to it could not be lost sight of. His second argument is that if for argument's sake the objection raised before the Returning Officer may be taken to be a valid one, the omission was just an ordinary technical matter and it was not a defect of any substantial character which could result in the rejection of the nomination paper itself and the learned counsel has referred me to Section 36(4) of R.P. Act which says that the Returning Officer shall not reject any nomination paper on the ground of any defect which is not of a substantial character. As regards nomination paper No. 11 the argument of the learned counsel is that sufficient particulars had been given, of the candidate as well as his proposer, in the said paper and the same could not, consequently, be rejected.

8. First I will consider the case regarding the nomination paper No. 11 (Ex. PW 2/3). The entries in this paper, as they stand, are:

1. Full name of proposer —(Naranjan Singh).
2. *Electoral Roll number of proposer—1446—Chural Khurd Bhag No. 17 Patwar Halqa) Chaun Halqa Lehra Zila Sangrur.
3. Name of the candidate's** father—Harchand Singh.
4. Full postal address of candidate—Wazir Singh Ward No. 4, three bridges, Simla.
5. *Electoral Roll number of candidate—1853.....**

From the above we find that a star mark is appearing against each one of the two columns, No. 2 and 5. There is a foot note below this nomination paper illustrating the star mark as below:

**Here insert—

- (i) the name of the Parliamentary constituency;
- (ii) the name of the component assembly or electoral college constituency in the electoral rolls of which the name of the proposer or the candidate as the case may be, has been entered;
- (iii) The serial number of the part of the electoral roll in which such entry occurs; and
- (iv) the serial number of the entry in that part.

Illustration—

Lucknow Parliamentary constituency; Lucknow City East Assembly constituency; Part 7; No. 368.....”

It is thus clear that all the particulars mentioned in the foot note were required to be given against columns No. 2 and 5 before it could be taken to be a valid nomination form. We, however, find that neither the name of the Parliamentary constituency, nor the name of the assembly constituency in the electoral rolls in which the name of Shri Wazir Singh had been entered, nor the serial No. of the part of the electoral roll in which such entry occurs were mentioned against column No. 5. Only the serial No. of the entry (No. 1853) at which the name of Shri Wazir Singh stood entered has been given. It is to be noted here that this was an election from Parliamentary Constituency Sangrur while the name of Shri Wazir Singh Jeji stood entered, as a voter, in Simla assembly constituency which is a part of Ambala Parliamentary constituency. Thus, according to the illustration given in the above referred foot note, the particulars that were necessary to be entered against column No. 5 (besides the serial No. 1853 which of course was given) were to be:

- (i) Sangrur Parliamentary constituency;
- (ii) Simla Assembly constituency; and
- (iii) Part 4”.

However, none of these matters is found to have been stated against the said column No. 5 and under the circumstances it is difficult to agree with learned counsel for the petitioner that inspite of all this omission, the said nomination paper No. 11 should be taken to have been properly filled in. Learned counsel for respondent has referred me to the definition of the term "electoral roll No."

as given in rule 2(f) of the Conduct of Election Rules, 1961 and this definition says:

"2(f): 'electoral roll number' of a person means—

- (i) The serial number of the entry in the electoral roll in respect of that person;
- (ii) the serial number of the part of the electoral roll in which such entry occurs; and
- (iii) the name of the constituency to which the electoral roll relates."

This is exactly given in the foot note by way of illustration, to the nomination form referred above. Thus there was a non compliance of the rules on the point inasmuch as neither the serial No. of the part of the electoral roll in which the name of Shri Wazir Singh Jeji, occurred, nor the name of the constituency to which the said electoral roll related were given. Similarly in column No. 2 the name of the Parliamentary constituency to which the proposer belonged is missing. According to the foot note referred above, this thing was necessary to be mentioned in respect of the proposer as well. It is correct that in column No. 4 the address of the candidate has been given as "Wazir Singh Ward No. 4, 3 Bridges Simla" and in column No. 3 his father's name has also been mentioned (Harchand Singh) which particulars tally with the entry at serial No. 1853 occurring in respect of the name of Shri Wazir Singh, in the relevant entry of the electoral roll furnished alongwith this nomination paper No. 11 (the said sheet on which the entry occurs being marked (Ex. PW2/4). That is, however, not sufficient compliance with the requirements of law. The postal address of a candidate is quite different thing from the other matters required according to the foot note as well as rule 2 of the Conduct of Election Rules referred above. Under the circumstances, I find that the order of rejection recorded by the learned Returning Officer in respect of this nomination paper No. 11 was perfectly justified.

9. Next we take nomination papers Nos. 14 and 15. It is to be noted that the defects which occurred qua nomination paper No. 11 do not at all exist qua these two nomination papers—Nos. 14 and 15, inasmuch as all necessary particulars, regarding the candidate and the proposer have been mentioned in these two papers. The entries in column Nos. 2 and 5 of the nomination paper No. 11 (Ex PW3/B) are as below:

"2. *Electoral roll number of proposer: Sangrur Parliamentary constituency, Lehra assembly constituency, Bhag No. 17, Voter No. 1446 Pind Chural Khurd.

5. *Electoral roll number of candidate—Ambala (S.C.) Parliamentary constituency, Simla assembly constituency, Part No. 4, Voter No. 1853, Ward No. 4, Simla....."

It is to be noted that the same Niranjan Singh who was the proposer qua nomination paper No. 11 was the proposer qua nomination paper No. 14. Nomination paper No. 15 (Ex PW2/2) was proposed by one Shivdarshan Singh and entries relating to him and relating to the candidate, as given in this nomination paper, are as below:

"2. *Electoral roll number of proposer: Sangrur Parliamentary constituency, Sunam State Legislature.

"(Column No. 2)

Assembly constituency Part No. 20 V. Chatha Nakta, voter No. 27.

5. *Electoral roll number of candidate—Ambala (S.C.) Parliamentary constituency, Simla Assembly constituency, Part No. 4 voter No. 1853, Ward No. 4, Simla....."

Consequently, these two nomination papers could not be objected to on any one of the grounds which are found to have existed qua nomination paper No. 11. There is, however, the fact that no copy of the electoral roll had been appended to any one of these papers and this defect was pointed by some of the candidates at the time of the scrutiny and it prevailed with the Returning Officer. It is now urged before me that the copy of the electoral roll which had been appended to nomination paper No. 11 could have been made use of in connection with these nomination papers as well. In this connection we have to refer to Section 33(5) of the Representation of People Act which says:

"S. 33(5) Where the candidate is an elector of a different constituency, a copy of the electoral roll of that constituency or of the relevant part

thereof or a certified copy of the relevant entries in such roll shall, unless it has been filed alongwith the nomination paper be produced before the Returning Officer at the time of scrutiny."

It has been noted above that Shri Wazir Singh was an elector of a different constituency (Ambala Parliamentary constituency) and consequently, his case is governed by the above referred provision of law. He was, consequently, bound to produce before the returning officer, either a copy of the entire electoral roll of Ambala Parliamentary constituency, or of the relevant part thereof (Simla assembly constituency) or a certified copy of the relevant entries in that roll (just a copy of roll relating to Ward No. 4 wherein his name was entered as a voter). This is because the returning officer of Sangrur Parliamentary constituency was not expected to be having a copy of the roll of Ambala Parliamentary constituency or of Simla assembly constituency. Shri Wazir Singh, however, had none with himself at that time as is clear from the order of the returning officer recorded on the said nomination papers No. 14 and 15. As regards the copy of the roll that stood appended to nomination paper No. 11, I am of the view that neither it could be legally taken into consideration for purposes of nomination papers No. 14 and 15, nor that was a copy warranted under above referred section 33(5). According to the prescribed procedure each nomination paper is to be taken up for scrutiny *separately*, and learned counsel for petitioner is not correct in his contention to the contrary. Accordingly nomination paper No. 11 was taken up first and, as already noted, it was rejected and rejected rightly. Thereafter nomination papers No. 12 and 13 were taken up and after those were scrutinised, papers at Nos. 14 and 15 were taken up. As is clear none of these nomination papers had a copy of the electoral roll appended to itself. I do not think, the returning officer was required, while scrutinising Nos. 14 and 15, to look back to nomination paper No. 11 in order to verify the particulars from the copy of the electoral roll lying appended to it. Even if it is so, the said electoral roll, as argued by learned counsel for respondent No. 1, is not the one which is contemplated by Section 33(5) of R.P. Act. It is neither a copy of the *entire* electoral roll nor a *complete* copy of a part thereof (Part No. 4) nor a *certified* copy of the relevant entries therein. It is not a complete copy of the relevant part in as much as it ends at serial No. 1524 while, in fact, the number of the total voters recorded in the said part No. 4, in the original roll is 1848. This is evident from Ex. RW4/1 which is a complete copy of the entire electoral roll of Simla Assembly constituency—comprising of 54 parts. Thus as many as 324 names are missing in the copy which Shri Wazir Singh appended to his nomination paper No. 11. Similarly there is an omission of 37 names in the "addenda" which is appended to, in the original roll Ex. RW4/1, the said part 4 wherefn the name of Shri Wazir Singh occurs. Only one sheet of the addenda has been appended to nomination paper No. 11 and it contains names of seven persons only including that of Shri Wazir Singh while, in fact, the original addenda contains names of 44 persons. It is thus clear that the electoral roll copy furnished by Shri Wazir Singh was not a complete copy of the relevant part of the electoral roll. At best it can be taken to be a copy of the relevant entries in that roll, but then it is not a *certified* copy which is the requirement of law under Section 33(5) referred above. This defect is common to all the three nomination papers, Nos. 11, 14 and 15, and although the learned returning officer did not take note of it, the respondent is perfectly entitled to point out the same and it cannot be ignored. This defect was duly pointed out in the written statement. Judged from this aspect, nomination paper No. 11 could not be accepted even if there had been other defect with the same.

10. Still another defect has been pointed out from respondent's side and this is with respect to the name of village of Niranjan Singh proposer as it occurs in the nomination papers Nos. 11 and 14. The said village is named as "Chural Khurd" in column No. 2 of these papers and the serial number of this voter is mentioned as 1446. A reference to Ex. D3 (relevant part of electoral roll relating to villages Chural Khurd and others), however, will make it clear that the last serial number relating to village Chural Khurd is No. 847. Thereafter entries relating to village Chural Kalan appear and it is amongst those entries that the name of Niranjan Singh appears at No. 1446. Chural Kalan is a different village from Chural Khurd (even though the two villages may be situated close to each other) and under the circumstances the name of the village relating to Shri Niranjan Singh was wrongly given in column No. 2 of nomination papers No. 11 and 14. There was thus non compliance with regard to clauses (iii) and (iv) of the footnote appearing under the nomination papers and hence these papers were liable to rejection on that score as well.

11. From the above, it would be found that all the three nomination papers of Shri Wazir Singh Jeji were rightly rejected by the returning officer. It is true

that Shri Wazir Singh made a request (vide his application ExPW2/1-A) for time being granted to him in order to produce the voters list in connection with his nomination papers No. 14 and 15 but the same was rejected by Returning Officer. This is what he has observed, on this point, in his order of rejection:—

"Having said so, I will now take up the request of the candidate that the scrutiny of this nomination paper may be adjourned and he may be allowed an opportunity to produce the relevant documents. In this connection the learned counsel for the candidate has pointed out Section 36(5) of the Representation of People Act, 1951 wherein it is laid down that if an objection is raised by the Returning Officer or is made by any other person, the candidate concerned may be allowed time to rebut it not later than the next day but one followed by scrutiny. I have given this request my careful consideration and feel that the omission sought to be rectified by the candidate is not a rebuttal, strictly speaking, and that giving him opportunity to furnish the relevant documents mentioned above, which he omitted to file with the nomination paper, would not be covered by this. I requested the candidate to produce these documents before me now if he had them but he wanted an adjournment...."

Thereafter the returning officer has referred to the instructions contained in para 5 page 14 of the *Hand-book* for candidates issued by the Election Commission of India whereby the candidates have been asked to keep ready in their possession, in order to meet any possible objection, a copy of the current electoral roll or a certified copy of the entry in the electoral roll bearing the candidate's name and that of his proposer. He has also referred to Section 33, clause (5) which I have already referred and then held that the request for adjournment could not be allowed. I am also of the same view. According to Section 33(5), it was necessary for Shri Wazir Singh to produce, at the time of scrutiny, a copy of the electoral roll or of the relevant part thereof or a certified copy of the relevant entries in that roll but he had none with himself at that time. The one which he had already furnished with nomination paper No. 11, could not be made use of, as discussed in detail above. Under the circumstances, he was not entitled to any adjournment.

12. Certain authorities have been cited by learned counsel for petitioner in support of certain contentions of his but I have gone through them and find that they are not applicable to the facts of the present case. The first authority cited is 10 Election Law Reports, page 189—Karnail Singh V. Election Tribunal Hissar and others—a case decided by Hon'ble Supreme Court. In that case the name of the part of the electoral roll in which the name of the candidate appeared was not filled up against the relevant column of the nomination paper. But there was no difficulty in identifying the candidate and the entry of his name in the roll was duly pointed out to the returning officer at the time of scrutiny. It was held that the defect was only a technical defect and was not a substantial character and the nomination paper was improperly rejected. The distinguishing features of that case have been given by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in its judgment and the nomination paper was found to be improperly rejected because there was no difficulty in identifying the candidate and the entry of his name in the roll had also been duly pointed. The other authority is 6, Election Law Reports, page 368 (Ajyab Singh and another V. Karnail Singh and others)—a case decided by Election Tribunal Hissar. The facts of that case were entirely different from those of the present one and there also it was held that in view of the record before the returning officer there was no difficulty in tracing out the necessary particulars and hence the order of returning officer rejecting the nomination paper was wrong. The other authority cited is 21, Election Law Reports, 338 (N. P. Velusami Thevar V. G. Raja Nainar and others)—a case decided by Madras High Court. There it has been held that the object of Section 33(5) of Representation of the People Act is that there should be evidence that the candidate in question is an elector of a different constituency and if that fact is reasonably clear and if a certified copy of the relevant entry relating to him is found to have been filed with the nomination paper, and defect in the copy will not amount to a defect of substantial character and the nomination paper should not be rejected. In the present case, as already held, no certified copy of the relevant entry had been furnished, and hence this authority will not apply. The last authority cited is 12, Election Law Reports, page 299 (Dahu Sao V. Ranglal Chaudhary and others) a case decided by Patna High Court. The facts there were that in the head line of the nomination paper the correct name of the constituency (Dhanbad constituency of Bihar) had been given in the blank space but in the two blank spaces appearing in the next line the word "Bihar" was written by mistake. It was held that as the head line sufficiently and clearly indicated that the nomination was for the "Dhanbad

constituency", the mistake in the line below the head line was a mistake of an unsubstantial character and was not a ground for rejecting the nomination paper under Section 36(4). The argument of the learned counsel is that since in the top line, the name of the constituency (Sangrur Parliamentary constituency) had been duly mentioned, it will not matter if this constituency was not named in the subsequent columns. Learned counsel may be correct in that contention but the question is that there were several other defects, as pointed out in detail above, and those cannot be called matters of unsubstantial character. Hence this authority also does not apply to the present case.

13. Learned counsel for the respondent has also cited certain authorities and one of them is: *I Election Law Reports*, 330. There it has been held that when a returning officer scrutinises the nomination papers, he should not scrutinise all the nomination papers collectively but should scrutinise them one after the other and in case the first nomination paper is found to be a valid one, it has to be accepted and there would be no adverse effect if the subsequent nomination papers are found to be invalid in any way. This authority lends support to the argument of the learned counsel that the returning officer in this case was duty bound to scrutinise each of the nomination papers separately and since paper No. 11 had already been rejected, the electoral roll copy appended to it, could not be taken into consideration *qua* the other nomination papers which followed. The other authority cited is, *20 Election Law Reports*, 63 (Chand Singh V. Sanker Lal) and it was held that the provision contained in Section 33(3) of the Representation of the People Act, is not directory but a mandatory one in its nature and a nomination paper can well be rejected if the above mentioned provision is not complied with. It was held that a candidate is required by the said provision, if he is an elector of a different constituency, to file with his nomination paper a copy of the electoral roll of that constituency or of the relevant part thereof or a certified copy of the relevant entries in such roll. Same view was taken in the authority *22 Election Law Reports*, page 425 (Vinaya Kumar Diwan V. Raghunathsingh Kiledar). Then I am referred to page 180 of Doabia's Election cases, Volume II (1864-1935) where it is observed:—

"Where only one declaration form was attached to a number of nomination papers, it was held that according to the plain meaning of the relevant rules the nomination papers, taken separately one by one and not one of the whole number being accepted, shall be accompanied by a declaration as regards the election agent."

These observations have been cited in support of the argument of the learned counsel that each nomination paper is to be a self contained document and must be accompanied by a copy of the electoral roll or relevant part thereof or certified copy of the relevant entries in that roll. The next authority cited is *2, Election Law Reports*, page 189 (Baddrudduja Syed V. Mohammad Khoda Buksh and others) and these are the observations made therein:—

"Omission to mention in a nomination paper for a seat in the House of the People the name of the relevant Parliamentary constituency in which the name of the candidate is included and the serial number of the candidate in the electoral roll of that constituency are grave errors and irregularities which materially affect the validity of a nomination and afford a sufficient ground for rejection of the nomination paper....."

The last authority from respondent's side, worth notice, is Doabia's Election cases, Vol. II, Part XI, page 489, where it has been held that failure to give the name of the constituency in a nomination paper constitutes non-compliance of the provisions of S. 33, Representation of the People Act. All these authorities do support the various contentions of learned counsel for respondent and are fully applicable to the present case.

14. On account of the above, I find that the nomination papers of Shri Wazir Singh, respondent No. 5, were rightly rejected by the returning officer, Issue No. 1 is consequently, decided against the petitioner and in favour of respondent No. 1. I have not touched the oral evidence produced by the parties, since it is not of any consequence owing to the matter involved being purely one of law and of record. It is, consequently, unnecessary to enter into discussion about this oral evidence.

Issue No. 2

15. This issue relates to the wrongful rejection of nomination paper of Shri Ujagar Singh candidate. On this point, learned counsel for petitioner has

not much to say. Ex. DI is a certified copy of the electoral roll of Assembly Constituency of Mahal Kalan and the name of Shri Ujagar Singh which originally stood at serial No. 377, is found to have been deleted in the "Corrigenda" appended to this Roll. The correctness of Ex. DI has been deposed to by R.W. 1 Harbans Singh, Naib-Tahsildar who attested this copy to be a true copy according to original roll. Under the circumstances, the order of rejection of nomination paper of Shri Ujagar Singh by the returning officer was perfectly justified. Issue No. 2 is, consequently, found against the petitioner and in favour of respondent No. 1.

Issue No. 10

16. Argument advanced by learned counsel for respondent is that petitioner did not take up the position, at the time of scrutiny, that the nomination papers of Shri Wazir Singh Jeji were perfectly valid and should not be rejected and hence he is now estopped from saying that, infact, the nomination papers were valid. I do not subscribe to this view of the learned counsel. Even if the petitioner did not say any such thing on that point, he is not now estopped from urging this matter in the election petition. This issue is, consequently, decided against the respondent and in favour of the petitioner.

17. On account of the above decision on various issues, this election petition fails and is hereby dismissed. Petitioner would pay Rs. 300/- as costs to respondent No. 1. Pronounced.

Dated: 8th November, 1963.

Sd. M. L. PURI,
Election Tribunal, Patiala.

[No. 82/262/62.]

By Order,
PRAKASH NARAIN, Secy.

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 9th December 1963

S.O. 3488.—In pursuance of clause (b) of sub-rule (2) of rule 14 of the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1957, the President hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Home Affairs No. S.R.O. 628, dated the 28th February 1957, namely:—

In the Schedule to the said notification, in Part I, under the heading "Central Reserve Police", below the existing entry in column 3, the entry "Inspector General of Police" shall be inserted and against the entry as so inserted the entry "(i) to (iii)" shall be inserted in column 4.

[No. F. 19/60/63-P.II.]

P. SITAPATI, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 11th December 1963

S.O. 3489.—In exercise of the powers conferred by entry 3(c) of Schedule I annexed to the Ministry of Home Affairs Notification No. 15/13/59(V)-P.IV, dated the 13th July 1962 (GSR No. 991, published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (i) dated the 28th July 1962), the Central Government is pleased to specify the following members of the family of the Ruler of Sayla:—

1. Shrimati Ranisahiba Manishwari Devi, wife of Ruler,
2. Yuvaraj Shri Pruthuraj-Sinhji, Heir—Apparent,
3. Rajkumar Shri Divyarak-Sinhji, Second son,
and
4. Rajkumar Shri Mahiraj-Sinhji, Third son,

for the purpose of that entry and directs that the exemption shall be valid in respect of one 12 bore gun, one rifle and one revolver/pistol each.

[No. 16/11/63-P.IV.]

New Delhi, the 13th December 1963

S.O. 3490.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (1) of article 239 of the Constitution, the President hereby directs that in the notifications of the Government of India in the Ministry of Home Affairs S.O. 3059, dated 19th October, 1963 and S.O. 3061, dated 19th October, 1963, published in the Gazette of India Part II, Section (3), sub-section (ii), dated 2nd November, 1963, for the words "Chief Commissioner", the word "Administrator" shall be substituted.

[No. 15/10/63-Police-IV.]

M. SIVAGNANAM, Dy. Secy.

New Delhi, the 16th December 1963

S.O. 3491.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 and clause (5) of article 148 of the Constitution, and after consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor General of India in relation to persons serving in the Indian Audit and Accounts Department, the President hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1955, namely:—

1. These rules may be called the Central Civil Services (Conduct) (Second Amendment) Rules, 1963.

2. In the Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1955—

(a) for rule 4-A, the following rule shall be substituted, namely:—

"4-A.—Demonstrations and Strikes

No Government servant shall—

(i) engage himself or participate in any demonstration which is prejudicial to the interests of the sovereignty and integrity of India, the security of the State, friendly relations with foreign States, public order, decency or morality, or which involves contempt of court, defamation or incitement to an offence, or

(ii) resort to or in any way abet any form of strike in connection with any matter pertaining to his service or the service of any other Government servant".

(b) for rule 4-B, the following rule shall be substituted, namely:—

"4-B.—Joining of Associations by Government servants

No Government servant shall join, or continue to be a member of, an association the objects or activities of which are prejudicial to the interests of the sovereignty and integrity of India or public order or morality".

[No. 25/10/62-Ests.(A).]

B. D. JAYAL, Dy. Secy.

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 7th December 1963

S.O. 3492.—In pursuance of clause (a) of section 2 of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers (Oaths and Fees) Act, 1948, (41 of 1948), the Central Government hereby authorises Shri Santi Kumar Sanum, Assistant in the Embassy of India, Tananarive, to perform the duties of a Consular Agent, with immediate effect.

[No. T/4330/3/63.]

S. K. CHATTERJEE, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Economic Affairs)

New Delhi, the 13th December 1963

S.O. 3493.—Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, as on the 6th December 1963

BANKING DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.
Capital paid up	5,00,00,000	Notes	23,06,71,000
Reserve Fund	80,00,00,000	Rupee Coin	2,37,000
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	73,00,00,000	Small Coin	3,53,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	8,00,00,000	National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
		(a) Loans and Advances to :—	
		(i) State Governments	26,99,97,000
		(ii) State Co-operative Banks	9,26,96,000
		(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks	
		(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures	3,55,31,000
Deposits :—		National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	
(a) Government		Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks	
(i) Central Government	84,01,29,000	Bills purchased and Discounted :—	
(ii) State Governments	10,20,66,000	(a) Internal	
(b) Banks		(b) External	
(i) Scheduled Banks	82,93,35,000	(c) Government Treasury Bills	91,03,91,000
(ii) State Co-operative Banks	2,09,79,000	Balances held Abroad*	12,76,19,000
(iii) Other Banks	4,61,000	Loans and Advances to Governments**	46,53,88,000
(c) Others	166,29,19,000	Loans and Advances to :—	
Bills Payable	32,65,15,000	(i) Scheduled Banks†	14,60,75,000
Other Liabilities	39,08,41,000	(ii) State Co-operative Banks†	134,10,99,000
		(iii) Others	1,53,30,000
		Investments	192,77,90,000
		Other Assets	27,00,59,000
Rupees	583,32,36,000	Rupees	583,32,36,000

*Includes Cash and Short-term Securities.

**Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund, but including temporary overdrafts to State Governments.

† Includes Rs. 4,44,00,000 advanced to scheduled banks against usance bills under Section 17(4) (c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

†† Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund.

Dated, the 11th day of December, 1963.

An Account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, for the week ended the 6th day of December, 1963.

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department .	23,06,71,000		Gold Coin and Bullion t—		
Notes in circulation . . .	2313,53,08,000		(a) Held in India . . .	117,76,10,000	
Total Notes issued . . .		2336,59,79,000	(b) Held outside India	
			Foreign Securities . . .	92,45,69,000	
			TOTAL . . .		210,21,79,000
			Rupee Coin . . .		117,06,98,000
TOTAL LIABILITIES . . .		2336,59,79,000	Government of India Rupee Securities . . .		2009,31,02,000
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper . . .		
			TOTAL ASSETS . . .		2336,5979,000

Dated, the 11th day of December, 1963.

P. C. BHATTACHARYYA,
Governor.

[No. F. 3(2)-BC/63]

A. BAKSI, Jt. Secy.

(Department of Economic Affairs)

New Delhi, the 16th December 1963

S.O. 3494.—The Central Government, having considered the application for renewal of recognition made under section 3 of the Securities Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1956 (42 of 1956), by the Madhya Pradesh Stock Exchange, Indore, and being satisfied that it would be in the interest of the trade and also in the public interest so to do, hereby grants, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 4 of the said Act, recognition to the said Exchange under the said section 4 for a further period of five years commencing from the 24th December, 1963, and ending with the 23rd December, 1968, in respect of contracts in securities subject to such conditions as may be prescribed or imposed hereafter.

[No. F. 1/3/SE/EAD/63.]

S. S. SHARMA, Under Secy.

(Dept. of Revenue)

(Gold Control Administration)

New Delhi, the 12th December 1963

S.O. 3495.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (4) of rule 126 J, read with rule 126 X, of the Defence of India Rules, 1962, the Central Government hereby rescinds the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance (Department of Economic Affairs) No. S.O. 132 dated the 11th January, 1963. This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 1st day of October, 1963.

[No. 9/63.]

B. D. PANDE, Additional Secy.

CENTRAL BOARD OF REVENUE

INCOME-TAX

New Delhi, the 12th December 1963

S.O. 3496.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 122 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), and in supersession of all previous notifications in this regard, the Central Board of Revenue hereby directs that the Appellate Assistant Commissioners of Income-tax of the Ranges specified in column 1 of the schedule below shall perform their functions in respect of all persons and incomes assessed to income-tax or super-tax in the Income-tax Circles, Wards and Districts specified in the corresponding entry in column 2 thereof:—

SCHEDULE

Range 1	Income-tax Circles, Wards and Districts 2
Agra	1. Agra. 2. Firozabad. 3. Mathura.
Moradabad	1. Moradabad. 2. Rampur. 3. Najibabad.
Lucknow	1. Project Circle, Lucknow. 2. Lucknow. 3. Estate Duty-cum-Income-tax Circle, Lucknow. 4. Special Investigation Circle, Lucknow.
Gorakhpur	1. Gorakhpur. 2. Azamgarh. 3. Gonda. 4. Sitapur.

Varanasi	1. Varanasi. 2. Special Survey Circle, Varanasi. 3. Project Circle, Varanasi. 4. Faizabad.
Allahabad	1. Allahabad. 2. Central Circle, Allahabad. 3. Mirzapur. 4. Jaunpur. 5. Estate Duty-cum-Income-tax Circle, Allahabad.
Kanpur I	1. Estate Duty-cum-Income-tax Circle, Kanpur. 2. District I, Kanpur. 3. Banda. 4. Special Investigation Circle, Kanpur. 5. Fatehgarh.
Kanpur II	1. Distt. III, Kanpur. 2. Jhansi. 3. Special Survey Circle, Kanpur. 4. Project Circle, Kanpur. 5. Special Survey Circle, Lucknow. 6. Distt. II, Kanpur. 7. Central Circle, Kanpur. 8. Etawah.
Dehra Dun	1. Dehra Dun. 2. Saharanpur. 3. Muzaffarnagar. 4. Bulandshahr.
Bareilly	1. Bareilly. 2. Aligarh.
Meerut	1. Meerut. 2. Special Investigation Circle 'A' Meerut. 3. Special Investigation Circle 'B' Meerut. 4. Salary Circle, Meerut. 5. Project Circle, Meerut. 6. Estate Duty-cum-Income-tax Circle, Meerut. 7. Special Survey Circle, Meerut.

Where an Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof stands transferred by this notification from one Range to another Range, appeals arising out of assessments made in that Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof and pending immediately before the date of this notification before the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of the Range from whom that Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred shall, from the date this notification shall take effect, be transferred to and dealt with by the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of the Range to whom the said Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred.

This notification shall take effect from 20th December, 1963.

Explanatory Note

The amendments have become necessary on account of the re-organisation of the Appellate Ranges in charge of the Commissioner of Income-tax, Uttar Pradesh.

(The above note does not form a part of the notification but is merely clarificatory).

[No. 75 (F.No. 50/15/63-1T)].

J. RAMA IYER, Under Secy.

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY COLLECTOR OF CENTRAL EXCISE,
GUNTUR, A.P.

NOTICE

Guntur, the 11th December 1963

S.O. 3497.—Whereas it appears that goods of foreign origin detailed below found with consignment Notes Nos. 2038/29-7-63 and 2039/29-7-63, lying at the delivery office of the Economic Transport Organisation, Meraka Street, Rajahmundry having been transported from Calcutta were seized by the Central Excise Officers, Rajahmundry for contravention of Section 3(2) of the Import and Export (Control) Act, 1947 read with Section 11 of the Customs Act, 1962.

Consignment Note No.	Contents	Qty.
No. 2038/29-7-62.	3 Gunny packages G/P bags each containing 2 mat covered bundles of (Dalchini) (Cinnamon)	237 Kg gross. 222 Kg nett.
No. 2039/29-7-63.	3 C/S deal wood cases each containing Japan made camphor.	180 Kgs gross. 136.2 Kgs nett.

Whereas it also appears that the address of the consignor is noted as Mahabir and Company, 167, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-7 and the address of the consignee is noted as Sohanlal Gupta Rajahmundry in C/N No. 2039 and Parasmal Jain, Main Road, Rajahmundry in C/N No. 2038 and the description of the goods is noted as Cosio in C/N No. 2038 and Glaxo in C/N No. 2039 but the consignees have not come forward to claim the goods and the consignor firm is reported to be non-existent.

Claimants, if any, of the above goods should prefer their claims to the Deputy Collector of Central Excise, Central Revenue Buildings, Guntur-4 and show cause to him within 1 month of the date of the publication of this notice together with evidence in support of their claim. They should also show cause as to why the above goods should not be confiscated under Section 111 of the Customs Act, 1962 read with Section 3(2) of the Import and Export (Control) Act, 1947.

If there is no response to this notice these goods will be treated as unclaimed and abandoned and will be disposed of as per rules.

[No. C. No. VIII/10/18/63.]

V. B. GORDON, Dy. Collector.

MINISTRY OF STEEL, MINES AND HEAVY ENGINEERING

(Department of Mines and Metals)

New Delhi, the 18th December 1963

S.O. 3498.—In pursuance of clause 4 of the Colliery Control Order, 1945, as continued in force by section 16 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955 (10 of 1955), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Mines and Fuel No. S.O. 1537, dated the 1st June, 1963, namely:—

In the said notification, in Table III, for the existing entries in the second, third and fourth columns against the entry "Margherita collieries of the Assam Railways and Trading Company" in the first column, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

	Rs. nP.	Rs. nP.
"Run-of-mine	34.73	34.18
Dust coal	34.73	34.18
Hand-picked coal	41.24	40.59
Hard coke	93.82	92.34"

[No. C5-12(3)/63.]

N. LAKSHMAN RAU, Dy. Secy.

(Department of Mines and Metals)

ERRATA

New Delhi, the 10th December 1963

In the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Mines and Fuel, No. SO-3162, dated the 4th November, 1963 and published in Part II, Section 3, sub-section (ii) of the Gazette of India Extraordinary, dated 6th November 1963, at pages 695 and 696,

at page 696:—

- (i) In the twenty-fourth line
for "367 370" read "367, 370."
- (ii) In the twenty-fifth line for "hingurda" read "Jhingurda".

MINISTRY OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

(Office of the Jt. Chief Controller of Imports & Exports)

ORDER

Calcutta, the 13th November 1963

S.O. 3499.—Whereas M/s. Jyoti Brothers, P-11, New Howrah Bridge Approach Road, Calcutta, or any Bank or any other person have not come forward furnishing sufficient cause against Notice No. 8/60/CDN. dated 20th June 1963 proposing to cancel licence No. E297959/61/EI/CCI/C, dated 20th July 1961 valued at Rs. 1,037 for import of Borax [Sr. No. 22-31(a)/V] from the General Currency Area except South and South West Africa, granted to the said M/s. Jyoti Brothers, P-11, New Howrah Bridge Approach Road, Calcutta, the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Calcutta, Government of India, in the Ministry of International Trade in exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955, hereby cancels the said licence No. E297959/61/EI/CCI/C, dated 20th July 1961 issued to the said M/s. Jyoti Brothers, P-11, New Howrah Bridge Approach Road, Calcutta.

[No. 89/60/CDN.]

J. MUKHERJI,
Dy. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports.

MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

(Department of Food)

New Delhi, the 12th December 1963

S.O. 3500.—In pursuance of sub-rule (2) of rule 11, clause (b) of sub-rule (2) of rule 14 and sub-rule (1) rule 23 of the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1957, the President hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Department of Food) No. G.S.R. 68, dated the 21st February, 1958, namely:—

In the Schedule to the said notification, in Part I—General Central Service, Class III, under the sub-heading, 'Office of the Pay and Accounts Officer, Bombay/Calcutta/New Delhi', for item "(ii) Other Class III posts" and the entries relating thereto, the following item and entries shall be substituted, namely:—

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(ii) Other Class III posts	Pay and Accounts Officer	Pay and Accounts Officer	All	Chief Pay and Accounts Officer."

[No. 7(23)/63/AVU.]

JOGINDER SINGH, Under Secy

(Department of Agriculture)
(Indian Council of Agricultural Research)

New Delhi, the 9th December 1963

S.O. 3501.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section 4(ii), (v), (vi), (vii) and (viii) of Section 4 of the Indian Lac Cess Act, 1930 (24 of 1930), as amended from time to time, the Central Government is pleased to nominate the following persons on the Governing Body of the Indian Lac Cess Committee to represent the interests mentioned against them up to 31st March, 1966:—

Sub-Section of the Act.	Name of the member	Interest represented.
4(ii)	Prof. T. R. Seshadri, Head of the Deptt. of Chemistry, University of Delhi, Delhi.	Chairman, Advisory Board, Indian Lac Cess Committee.
4(v)	Shri G. S. Jayaswal, C/o. M/s. Ram Kishore Jayaswal Pvt. Ltd., Calcutta.	Shellac Export Trade.
4(vi)	Shri P. D. Jalan, C/o. M/s. Srigopal Purshot-tamdas, Calcutta.	Lac Brokers and Shellac Brokers.
4(vii)	Shri Ramdeni Ram, M.L.A., Village & P.O. Babhundi, Distt. Palamau.	Cultivators of lac in Bihar.
4(vii)	The Chief Conservator of Forests, Orissa,	Cultivators of lac in Orissa.
4(viii)	Shri G. C. L. Joneja, Chairman, Shellac Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Export Promotion Council, Calcutta.	Export Promotion Council, Calcutta.

[No. 3-37/63-Com.IV.]

N. K. DUTTA, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT

(Transport Wing)

New Delhi, the 11th December 1963

S.O. 3502.—In pursuance of rules 111, 112 and 114 of the Defence of India Rules, 1962, the Central Government hereby makes the following Order prescribing the compensation payable in respect of requisitioning or acquisition of vessels to which the provisions of the Inland Steam-Vessels Act, 1917 (I of 1917) apply, namely:—

1. (a) the rate of interest referred to in clause (i) of rule 111 shall be four per cent per annum (simple);
 (b) the depreciation referred to clause (ii) of rule 111 shall be calculated at the rate and in the manner prescribed under the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) for vessels;
 (c) the percentage referred to in clause (iii) of rule 111 shall be four per cent per annum on the depreciated value of the vessel determined in the manner prescribed under the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961).
2. The depreciation referred to in the first proviso to rule 112 of the said Rules shall be calculated at the rate and in the manner prescribed under the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961).
3. (a) The compensation determined by the competent authority for requisitioning or acquiring of a vessel shall be paid within a period of two months from the date on which it falls due.
 (b) The rate of interest referred to in the proviso to rule 114 of the said Rules shall be four per cent per annum (simple).
 (c) After compensation in arrear on the first day of each month following the date of requisition of a vessel has been worked out, interest shall be payable on such part of that amount as has been outstanding for

more than two months, periods of less than a month being ignored for the purpose of computing the interest.

[No. 1-T(203)/63.]

K. SRINIVASAN, Dy. Secy.

INDIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT

NOTICE

S.O. 3503.—

In the matter of Companies Act, 1956

AND

In the matter of the Government Telephones Board Ltd. (in Liquidation).

MEMBERS' VOLUNTARY WINDING-UP.

Name of Company: The Government Telephones Board Ltd. (in liquidation).

Notice Convening final meeting.

Notice is hereby given in pursuance of Section 497 that a general meeting of the members of the above-named Company will be held in the office room of Member (S & P), P. & T. Directorate Building, Parliament Street, New Delhi on 3rd day of February, 1964 at 1130 O'clock in the forenoon for the purpose of having an account laid before them showing the manner in which the winding-up has been conducted and the property of the Company disposed of and of hearing any explanation that may be given by the liquidator and also of determining by a special resolution of the Company, the manner in which the books, accounts and documents of the Company and of the liquidator shall be disposed of (a copy of special resolution has been sent to members of the Company).

Dated this 13th day of December, 1963.

S. K. KANJILAL,
Signature of the Liquidator.

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

(Department of Education)

New Delhi, the 11th December 1963

S.O. 3504—In the Notification No. S.O. 2371 (No. F.16-22/63-C.2), dated the 27th November 1963 for the words "Dr. S. Ranganathan" occurring in paragraph 1, read "Dr. S. R. Ranganathan".

[No. F. 16-22/63. C.2]

V. P. AGNIHOTRI, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF WORKS, HOUSING & REHABILITATION

(Department of W. & H.)

New Delhi, the 16th December 1963

S.O. 3505—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1958 (32 of 1958), the Central Government hereby appoints the officer mentioned in column 1 of the table below being gazetted officer of Government, to be estate officer for the purposes of the said Act who shall exercise the powers conferred, and perform the duties imposed, on estate officers by or under the said Act within the local limits of their respective

jurisdiction in respect of the public premises specified in the corresponding entries in column 2 of the said table.

THE TABLE

Designation of officer	Categories of public premises and local limits of jurisdiction
Estate Manager, Bombay.	Ex-Government Grain Shop No. 156, Shop Nos. 3 and 4 in Sunbeam Chambers, Municipal Nos. 7A and 7B, New Marine Drive Road, Bombay.

[No. 24/8/62-EEII/Acc.II.]

S. L. VASUDEV, Under Secy.

(Department of Rehabilitation)

(Office of the Chief Settlement Commissioner)

New Delhi, the 13th December 1963

S.O. 3506.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of Sub-Section (2) of Section 18 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation & Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (No. 44 of 1954), the Central Government hereby appoints for the Union Territory of Delhi, Shri R. A. Awasthi for the time being holding the post of Assistant Custodian, in the office of Regional Settlement Commissioner, Delhi as Managing Officer for the custody, management and disposal of Compensation Pool with effect from the 3rd October, 1963.

[No. 4(48)/Admn/(Prop)/58/ARG.]

KANWAR BAHADUR,
Settlement Commissioner (A) & Ex-Officio, Dy. Secy

DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

New Delhi, the 11th December 1963

S.O. 3507.—In pursuance of the provision of sub-section (4) of Section 22 of the Delhi Development Act, 1957, the Delhi Development Authority has replaced at the disposal of the Central Government the land described in the Schedule below for placing it at the disposal of the Land and Development Officer, Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply, Government of India, New Delhi for further transfer to Shri Digambar Jain Panchayat for the construction of a temple in Dev Nagar Area.

SCHEDULE

Piece of land measuring 117 sq. yds. bearing Khasra Nos. 3256/719/3 Block 'S' situated in Basti Rehgar, W.E.A., Estate.

The above piece of land is bounded as follows:—

NORTH: ORIGINAL ROAD.

SOUTH: STREET.

EAST: STREET.

WEST: KHASRA No. 719/PLOT No. 2
Do

[No. S/5(652)/56.]

R. K. VAISH, Secy.

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS

New Delhi, the 11th December 1968

S.O. 3508.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from drill sites to collecting station within the Ankleshwar oil field in Gujarat State, pipelines should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission and that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the Schedule annexed hereto;

2. Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein.

3. Any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the competent authority at Elampoco, 4th Floor, Sayajiganj, Opp. College Lokmanya Tilak Road, Baroda, in the office of the Gujarat Pipeline Project, Oil and Natural Gas Commission. Every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEUDLE

State : Gujarat

District : Broach

Tehsil : Ankleshwar

Village	Survey No.	Acre	Guntha	Village	Survey No.	Acre	Guntha
Adol	43	0	3	Hajat	215	0	3
"	44	0	3	"	222/1	0	3
"	45	0	7	"	223	0	3
"	48	0	2	"	230	0	1
"	49	0	3	"	233	0	1
"	60	0	2	"	234/1	0	2
"	64	0	2	"	234/2	0	4
"	235	0	4	"	238	0	1
"	591	0	2	"	243	0	1
"	611	0	2	"	244/1	0	1
"	613	0	7	"	244/2	0	1
"	631/1	0	2	"	245	0	3
"	633	0	1	Sarthan	65/3	0	7
"	634/1	0	2			0	1
"	635	0	4			0	1
"	639	0	4			0	4
Digas	271	0	1	"	67/1	0	3
Hajat	184	0	7	"	67/2	0	2
"	188	0	3	"	67/3	0	1
"	195/1	0	2	"	70	0	1
"	197/1	0	4	"	71	0	2
"	198/2	0	5	"	72/1	0	1
"	199	0	1	"	72/2	0	1
"	205	0	1	"	146/1	0	1
"	208	0	2	"	146/2	0	1
"	214/1	0	4	"	147/3	0	3
"	214/2	0	1	Umarwada	235	0	4

[No. 31/67/63-ONG.]

S.O. 3509.—Whereas by a notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Mines and Fuel S.O. No. 1998, dated 20th July, 1963 under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipelines;

And whereas, the competent authority has, under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And, whereas, the Central Government has, after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the Schedule appended to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the Schedule appended to this notification is hereby acquired for laying the pipelines and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of that section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands shall, instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest on the date of the publication of this declaration in the Indian Refineries Limited free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

State : West Bengal. Dist. : Burdwan. Tehsil/Thana : Galsi

Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)	Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)
Maro, J.L. 9	1464	.04		5510	.005
	1469	.45		5511	.17
	1470	.18		5574	.16
	1471	.01		5575	.05
	1472	.005		5576	.09
	1480	.03		5582	.25
	1481	.03		5594	.11
	1482	.01		5600	.11
	1488	.01		5601	.04
	1501	.14		5602	.10
	1502	.05		5603	.13
	1503	.03		5605	.04
	1505	.09		5606	.01
	1508	.01		5607	.22
	1509	.13		5608	.07
	1527	.05		5600A	.04
	1528	.09		5924	.36
	1706	.05		5927	.15
	1708	.03		5928	.51
	1712	.02		5985	.13
	1713	.01		6002	.04
	1714	.05		6003	.02
	1715	.005		6072	.17
	1716	.01		6073	.14
	1736	.07		6075	.18
	1737	.10		6076	.01
	1743	.04		6077	.15
	1744	.09		6080	.11
	1745	.04		6081	.12
	1747	.005		6082	.15
	1750	.06		6083	.13
	1751	.04		6085	.07
	1752	.02		6086	.13
	1754	.18		6087	.005
	1757	.05		6097	.32
	1758	.04		6098	.02
	1762	.16		6100	.17
	1763	.005		6101	.23
	1764	.41		6107	.12
	1784	.06		6108	.14
	1785	.07		6110	.29
	1787	.41			
	1803	.05	Nurkona, J.L. 42	II	.01
	2074	.10		14	.16
	2077	.07		23	.06
	2078	.04		24	.12
	2079	.05		25	.16
	2080	.05		26	.41
	2082	.04		38	.11
	2236	.28		39	.20
	4854	.27		40	.02
	4857	.06		43	.04
	4858	.10		44	.03
	5509	.17		45	.02

Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)	Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)
Nurkona, J. L. 42— <i>contd.</i>	47	.01	Rakona, J. L. 45.— <i>contd.</i>	368	.14
	48	.05		371	.19
	49	.10		372	.11
	50	.005		373	.05
	51	.01		374	.02
	75	.36		375	.07
	76	.18		389	.29
	77	.04		390	.10
	78	.04		391	.09
	79	.11		423	.12
	80	.06		424	.05
	84	.30		425	.07
	85	.15		426	.10
	89	.43		427	.14
	90	.20		428	.02
	91	.02		429	.11
	92	.005		431	.10
	93	.08		435	.005
	94	.06		436	.02
	879	.02		1087	.23
	901	.21		1088	.005
	902	.10		1169	.13
	911	.22		1170	.23
	948	.17		1171	.31
	950	.08		1174	1.04
	951	.16		1201	.29
	953	.15	Raipur, J. L. 10	4169	.25
	954	.14		4170	.02
	955	.07		4171	.005
	957	.16		4241	.07
	958	.09		4242	.18
	1096	.07		4243	.08
	1097	.13		4244	.04
	1099	.39		4245	.02
	1114	.005		4246	.29
	1115	.17		4248	.37
	1116	.05		4822	.07
	1117	.02		4823	.17
	1119	.02		4824	.06
	1120	.10		4825	.10
	1121	.20		4826	.26
	1123	.23		4827	.03
	1124	.11		4830	.10
	1125	.09		4831	.04
	1126	.40		4832	.03
	1135	.10		4833	.05
	1137	.06		4842	.16
				4843	.03
Rakona, J. L. 45	33	.15		4844	.19
	34	.14		4846	.005
	40	.05		4847	.005
	65	.24		4848	.14
	70	.21		4849	.005
	71	.11		4850	.10
	72	.05		4851	.26
	73	.26		4854	.12
	74	.05		4855	.17
	80	.14		4856	.11
	81	.06		4857	.13
	259	.09		4858	.01
	261	.01		4936	.02
	262	.15		4937	.08
	265	.03		4938	.14
	267	.30		4939	.08
	268	.06		4942	.03
	269	.30		4946	.15
	270	.05		4949	.22
	367	.02		5228	.05

Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)	Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)
Belgram, J. L. 152			Belgram, J. L. 152—contd.		
	138	.27		751	.005
	142	.10		758	.02
	143	.05		759	.01
	145	.15		760	.15
	161	.08		763	.04
	203	.63		764	.01
	224	1.04		765	.005
	225	.10		766	.11
	226	.11		767	.04
	228	.01		777	.11
	229	.12		780	.02
	230	.08		781	.12
	231	.08		783	.14
	233	.03		3030	.14
	265	.34		3031	.13
	272	.36		3033	.10
	274	.14		3037	.18
	275	.15		3039	.05
	276	.005		3040	.19
	277	.19		3041	.01
	388	.15		3044	.36
	389	.13		3045	.38
	392	.09		3052	.02
	394	.14		3053	.09
	395	.10		3054	.11
	399	.11		3181	.47
	400	.02		3182	.19
	401	.01		3184	.14
	405	.07		3185	.005
	409	.03		3187	.09
	410	.005		3188	.14
	540	.06		3189	.05
	542	.10		3190	.005
	543	.22		3194	.03
	544	.07		3196	.02
	545	.07		3197	.02
	571	.16		3204	.01
	572	.10		3206	.24
	573	.21		3207	.10
	574	.07		3208	.10
	624	.04		3209	.35
	625	.45		3240	.15
	644	.08		3241	.16
	645	.03		3243	.17
	646	.005		3245	.19
	647	.02		3248	.19
	649	.15		3260	.34
	650	.16		3261	.02
	651	.09		3284	.04
	681	.05		3285	.17
	682	.15		3286	.05
	683	.04		3289	.24
	686	.21		3293	.15
	687	.21		3294	.12
	688	.13		4094	.19
	691	.09			
	692	.19	Sanko, J. L. 154	6674	.06
	693	.14		6675	.13
	740	.01		6677	.08
	741	.04		6678	.18
	742	.05		6680	.10
	746	.23		6750	.15
	747	.07		6751	.21
	748	.09		6760	.22
	749	.02		6765	.23
	750	.01		6766	.21

Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)	Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)
Sanko, J. L. 154— <i>contd.</i>			Khano, J. L. 139— <i>contd.</i>		
	6769	.05		5429	.02
	6770	.24		5449	.005
	6772	.10		5450	.27
	6800	.11		5451	.11
	6801	.16		5452	.005
	6806	.09		5456	.09
	6807	.12		5462	.30
	6812	.42		5466	.04
				5467	.15
Chak Muria, J. L. 138	754	.05		5470	.07
	757	.18		5477	.16
	758	.08		5481	.01
	759	.01		5482	.005
	783	.15		5483	.32
	784	.005		5485	.14
	786	.18		5486	.08
	971	.12		5495	.005
	975	.05		5496	.01
	976	.04		5497	.04
	977	.09		5498	.04
	978	.17		5499	.19
	979	.31		5566	.27
	980	.15		5568	.01
	983	.15		5569	.04
	985	.12		5570	.05
	986	.04		5571	.05
	987	.04		5572	.12
	988	.03		5573	.02
	989	.005		5574	.03
	1025	.17		5580	.005
	1026	.27		5609	.10
	1034	.28		5610	.12
	1035	.06		5611	.11
	1036	.08		5618	.09
	1037	.11		5619	.11
	1038	.28		5620	.01
	1040	.005		5625	.11
	1054	.005		5626	.09
	1059	.05		5627	.07
	1100	.14		5628	.07
	1101	.06		5636	.11
	1103	.11		5637	.05
	1105	.005		5639	.03
	1107	.13		5640	.02
	1109	.28		5641	.02
				5680	.01
Urah, J. L. 137	1	.08		5683	.005
	36	.19		5684	.02
	77	.05		5685	.03
	78	.05		5686	.13
	79	.07		5687	.005
	80	.02		5688	.01
	81	.07		5689	.03
	82	.02		5690	.10
	83	.11		5693	.005
	224	.18		5696	.24
	226	.09		5697	.17
	737	.21		5698	.05
				7802	.08
Khano, J. L. 139	5416	.23		7806	.45
	5417	.01		7807	.03
	5422	.005		7808	.15
	5425	.37		7809	.14
	5426	.23		7810	.005
	5427	.17		7848	.43
	5428	.005		7862	.13

Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)	Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)
Khano, J. L. 139— <i>contd.</i>			Chandanpur, J. L. 151— <i>contd.</i>		
	7863	.12		138	.12
	7865	.01		139	.02
	7866	.14		140	.15
	7877	.34		141	.09
	7879	.07		142	.10
	7881	.39			
	7900	.005	Kurmuna, J. L. 150		
	7902	.16		34	.05
	7903	.09		35	.03
	7921	.08		36	.03
	7922	.49		37	.24
	7926	.39		50	.23
	7927	.16		51	.11
	7941	.01		52	.08
	8282	.005		59	.19
	9362	.03		62	.15
	9363	.10		63	.19
	9365	.10		64	.02
	9366	.03		74	.10
	9367	.02		77	.09
	9585	.27		186	.15
	9592	.16		187	.19
	9593	.10		188	.24
	9596	.19		189	.06
	9598	.21		208	.14
	9599	.005		212	.36
	9601	.09		213	.04
				275	.05
Mure, J. L. 140	899	.14		216	.16
	900	.07		217	.28
	901	.02		220	.16
	902	.005		221	.005
				224	.005
Sati Nandi, J. L. 149	5710	.18	Babla, J. L. 98		
	5714	.16		394	.05
	5715	.22		406	.23
	5716	.005		407	.30
	5718	.20		408	.15
	5719	.12		410	.17
	5746	.17		414	.05
	5747	.18		417	.27
	5770	.11		418	.24
	5771	.28		454	.09
	5772	.10		455	.24
	5780	.12		457	.43
	5782	.28		477	.17
Chandanpur, J. L. 151	24	.36		479	.13
	25	.19		480	.03
	39	.005		484	.41
	40	.05		485	.09
	41	.11		486	.20
	42	.07		492	.27
	43	.04		617	.08
	48	.18		626	.02
	60	.005		627	.15
	87	.10		636	.02
	88	.15		637	.23
	96	.25		638	.16
	97	.12		640	.07
	98	.12		641	.03
	99	.02		642	.01
	107	.15		1064	.11
	109	.20		1065	.05
	133	.12		1066	.02
	134	.12		1071	.02
				1072	.07

Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)	Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)
Babla, J. L. 98— <i>Contd.</i>	1073	.03	Galsi, J. L. 99— <i>Contd.</i>	2780	.005
	1074	.03		2781	.05
	1075	.11		2782	.52
	1076	.005		2783	.15
	1099	.10		2784	.01
	1100	.18		2815	.12
	1101	.23		2816	.06
	1103	.07		2817	.09
	1104	.03		2818	.01
	1131	.13		2829	.18
	1132	.03		2831	.03
	1133	.10		2832	.02
	1135	.11		3405	.15
	1136	.24		3407	.53
	1138	.19		3420	.005
	1139	.16		3423	.02
	1191	.19		3424	.08
	1192	.03		3425	.09
	1193	.17		3426	.005
	1194	.12		3440	.16
	1195	.07		3441	.26
	1210	.01		3446	.04
	1211	.13		3447	.03
	1212	.06		3448	.03
	1214	.26		3449	.03
	1215	.01		3450	.15
	1766	.16		3480	.02
				3481	.10
Galsi, J. L. 99 . . .	151	.02		3946	.16
	152	.07		3947	.01
	153	.005		3948	.20
	175	.19		3950	.02
	176	.05		3951	.08
	179	.03		3952	.39
	180	.14		3953	.09
	181	.12		3954	.19
	183	.06		3955	.17
	184	.11		3956	.02
	185	.17		4195	.14
	195	.12		4196	.07
	196	.02		4197	.005
	197	.04		4199	.01
	198	.06		4200	.02
	206	.005		4201	.20
	207	.13		4205	.01
	211	.06		4206	.09
	213	.19		4207	.005
	216	.05		4208	.01
	222	.42		4209	.03
	227	.12		4216	.13
	238	.12		4217	.02
	231	.17		4218	.01
	233	.21		4219	.04
	250	.03		4220	.005
	251	.12		4263	.12
	252	.02		4264	.07
	253	.02		4289	.01
	254	.08		4329	.005
	456	.05		4330	.25
	457	.25		4331	.13
	459	.15		4332	.02
	2714	.07		4333	.14
	2715	.09		4334	.24
	2716	.09		4335	.09
	2717	.36		4396	.13
	2724	.14		4397	.06
	2725	.10		4398	.15
	2734	.16		4400	.09

Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)	Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)
Galsi, J. L. 99 --contd.	4401	.005	Pursha, J. L. 85	159	.05
	4406	.005		160	.02
	4407	.13		167	.33
	4408	.08		168	.005
	4409	.33		169	.44
	4410	.10		171	.03
	4413	.20		172	.01
Jot Kolkol, J. L. 47	208	.40		173	.04
	209	.22		176	.12
	238	.13		177	.09
	239	.03		178	.05
	240	.05		179	.06
	241	.05		180	.005
	243	.07		194	.08
	253	.24		195	.07
	254	.20		196	.06
	255	.18		198	.01
	256	.05		213	.005
	258	.15		215	.06
	261	.26		216	.30
	262	.28		218	.02
	277	.005		219	.12
	281	.26		220	.06
	282	.32		221	.12
	284	.20	Golgram, J. L. 89	1105	.21
	310	.16		1144	.01
	311	.09		1150	.005
	312	.01		1152	.26
	315	.39		1153	.65
	316	.22		1155	.18
	321	.25		1156	.19
	322	.14		1158	.30
	579	.005		1173	.42
	583	.57		1184	.29
	587	.16		1185	.18
	592	.16		1200	.01
	593	.38		1201	.34
	594	.17		1204	.005
	686	.04		1205	.10
	687	.37		1206	.15
	713	.18		1219	.15
	714	.23		1220	.09
	801	.38		1221	.25
	802	.06		1222	.24
Kolkol, J. L. 86	2206	.10		1397	.04
	2209	.02		1398	.30
	2210	.12		1399	.03
	2212	.36		1402	.26
	2213	.22		1450	.03
	2223	.34		1465	.02
	2231	.03		1467	.20
	2232	.36		1480	.12
	2233	.09		1481	.15
	2236	.26		1482	.23
	2237	.28		1483	.07
	2239	.13		1485	.03
	3589	.17		1494	.07
	3590	.01		1497	.06
	3593	.25		1498	.02
	3594	.25		1499	.05
	3595	.25		1500	.48
	3596	.12		1501	.06
	3607	.005		1502	.07
				1517	.04

Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)	Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)		
Golgram, J. L. 89—contd.					Golgram, J. L. 89—contd.		
	1518	.25		5025	.15		
	1729	.22		5026	.15		
	2286	.20		5051	.30		
	2287	.11		5052	.23		
	2288	.21		5055	.10		
	2305	.08		5056	.07		
	2315	.27		5063	.17		
	2316	.23		5064	.30		
	2317	.06		5065	.07		
	2318	.08		5066	.23		
	2319	.10		5067	.02		
	2324	.32		5069	.005		
	2325	.15		5070	.12		
	2329	.15		5071	.005		
	2330	.26		5088	.23		
	2331	.05		7238	.15		
	2360	.05		7239	.005		
	2369	.37					
	2370	.21	Mankar, J. L. 37				
	2371	.19		3533	.01		
	2373	.20		8055	.13		
	2374	.15		8057	.35		
	2385	.06		8058	.17		
	2386	.21		8059	.005		
	2388	.14		8163	.19		
	2389	.33		8164	.14		
	2394	.37		8167	.11		
	2395	.05		8272	.14		
	2400	.24		8273	.01		
	2401	.70		8274	.20		
	2409	.30		8276	.11		
	4799	.03		8277	.005		
	4801	.01		8278	.09		
	4802	.22		8279	.14		
	4818	.11		8280	.15		
	4823	.23		8287	.11		
	4824	.04		8288	.27		
	4830	.17		8289	.09		
	4850	.29		8318	.05		
	4851	.20		8344	.13		
	4856	.07		8345	.36		
	4863	.03		8352	.33		
	4864	.005		8360	.03		
	4865	.34		8361	.11		
	4866	.29		8362	.005		
	4895	.21		8364	.14		
	4896	.05		8369	.18		
	4963	.15		8373	.17		
	4964	.29		8381	.13		
	4967	.05		8583	.01		
	4970	.09		8586	.06		
	4971	.04		8587	.05		
	4972	.06		8588	.04		
	4973	.05		8591	.10		
	4974	.08		8592	.16		
	4992	.10		8598	.005		
	4993	.14		8610	.005		
	4994	.08		8611	.09		
	4995	.11		8612	.09		
	5000	.10		8613	.03		
	5001	.17		8614	.04		
	5002	.06		8615	.09		
	5016	.24		8618	.09		
	5022	.22		8619	.12		
	5023	.23		8620	.11		
				8621	.09		

Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)	Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)
Phagabanpur, J. L. 36—contd.					
L. 35	7	.02		450	.18
	140	.63		451	.36
	143	.12		457	.005
J.L. 36	1	.29	Sarul, J. L. 136	73	.13
	2	.03		74	.18
	3	.33		77	.02
	4	.005		78	.14
	5	.14		79	.04
	7	.16		80	.01
	82	.01		97	.11
	83	.23		98	.34
	84	.17		100	.26
	89	.29		101	.22
	96	.21		104	.01
	99	.06		105	.19
	100	.01		136	.24
	102	.13		139	.09
	103	.03		243	.24
	133	.15		244	.01
	135	.02		246	.24
	136	.03		248	.12
	137	.005		249	.03
	139	.09		250	.22
	140	.05		260	.41
	141	.07		261	.16
	145	.07		290	.12
	147	.23		291	.02
	232	.005		292	.04
	233	.05		295	.005
	234	.21		311	.42
	235	.07		325	.20
	236	.10		371	.20
	237	.08		372	.18
	238	.07		375	.16
	239	.01		376	.18
	264	.31		381	.06
	265	.12		382	.06
	290	.01		383	.06
	313	.31		384	.07
	314	.29		390	.18
	315	.09		395	.21
	316	.10		396	.05
	317	.12		402	.20
	356	.05		403	.12
	366	.18		405	.15
	367	.07		406	.04
	368	.03		407	.05
	369	.06	Jharul, J. L. 46	1645	.01
	388	.03		1646	.02
	389	.005		1647	.005
	390	.11		1651	.10
	391	.07		1661	.30
	397	.09		1662	.27
	398	.005		1663	.25
	400	.07		1664	.09
	401	.11		1665	.09
	402	.17		1667	.005
	403	.12			
	443	.09	Parr, J. L. 48	61	.03
	444	.62		62	.24
	447	.01		63	.04
	448	.03		92	.005
	449	.07		93	.50

Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)	Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)
Paraj, J. L. 48— <i>contd.</i>	95	.30	Paraj, J. L. 48— <i>contd.</i>	110	.09
	97	.35		281	.11
	105	.06		282	.005
	108	.05		927	.08
	109	.46			

[No. 31/33/63-ONG.]

S.O. 3510.—Whereas by a notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Mines and Fuel S.O. No. 2045, dated 10th August 1963, under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government declared its intention to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the Schedule appended to that notification for the purpose of laying pipelines;

And whereas, the competent authority has, under sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, submitted report to the Government;

And, whereas, the Central Government has, after considering the said report, decided to acquire the right of user in the lands specified in the Schedule appended to this notification;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the right of user in the said lands specified in the Schedule appended to this notification is hereby acquired for laying the pipelines and in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of that section, the Central Government directs that the right of user in the said lands, shall, instead of vesting in the Central Government, vest on the date of the publication of this declaration in the Indian Refineries Limited free from all encumbrances.

SCHEDULE

State : West Bengal Distt. : Burdwan Tehsil/ Thana : Burdwan

Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)	Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)
Chandul, J. L. 14	5	.005	Chandul, J. L. 14— <i>contd.</i>	252	.03
	7	.23		253	.17
	8	.18		270	.24
	25	.03		271	.33
	26	.14		283	.10
	27	.06		288	.20
	28	.08		289	.12
	29	.18		297	.06
	30	.01		298	.06
	31	.14		299	.06
	57	.005		300	.04
	59	.18		302	.06
	60	.28		303	.08
	65	.25		304	.03
	66	.13		305	.23
	67	.18		306	.05
	68	.16		307	.26
	85	.01		310	.27
	86	.46		1530	.05
	87	.02			
	88	.10	Amar, J. L. 13	2706	.005
	89	.09		2707	.05
	90	.03		2708	.02
	94	.02		2709	.13
	248	.47		2710	.18

Village	Survey No.	Extent (Plot No.)	Village	Survey No.	Extent (Plot No.)
Amar, J. L. 13—contd.	2711	.03	Talit, J. L. 10	4	.06
	2735	.005		4465	.005
	2736	.11		4471	.17
	2737	.12		4497	.08
	2738	.13		4498	.02
	2739	.005		4501	.21
	2748	.13		4502	.04
	2749	.05		4503	.32
	2750	.05		4504	.02
	2751	.03		4505	.25
	2770	.13		4506	.005
	2771	.27		4507	.005
	2772	.12		4508	.32
	2774	.07		4537	.20
	2775	.09		4538	.03
	2776	.07		4542	.06
	2813	.23		4543	.01
	2814	.01			
	2822	.24			
	2840	.25	Nutangram, J. L. 12	1409	.15
	2841	.12		1412	.30
	2844	.20		1413	.19
	2845	.12		1414	.13
	2847	.14		1416	.08
	2848	.27		1417	.13
	2849	.01		1421	.03
	3005	.01		1433	.17
	3006	.46		1434	.06
	3007	.05		1442	.05
	3042	.05		1443	.15
	3043	.14		1444	.005
	3044	.22		1452	.05
	3045	.03		1453	.10
	3047	.27		1454	.01
	3049	.005		1455	.23
	3050	.30		1457	.08
	3069	.005		1459	.16
	3071	.08		1460	.17
	3072	.10		1462	.07
	3073	.22		1463	.11
	3074	.13		1466	.13
	3075	.11		1467	.14
	3088	.17		1475	.10
	3089	.29			
	3090	.15	Bedchhala, J. L. 45	8	.26
	3091	.13			
	3092	.11			
	3093	.005	Saraitkar, J. L. 46	310	.23
	3094	.13		312	.17
	3095	.05		313	.10
	3116	.20		314	.08
	3117	.19		315	.01
	3118	.38		318	.17
	3120	.19		320	.28
	3121	.05		321	.06
	3122	.16		335	.12
	3141	.01		336	.21
	3142	.19		337	.01
	5141	.14		352	.25
	5142	.16		353	.18
	5143	.24		375	.02
	5144	.20		377	.21
	5145	.13		378	.08
	5151	.15		379	.0
	5153	.27		384	.03
	5154	.14		445	.17
	5155	.01		446	.05

Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)	Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)
Saraitikar, J.L. 46— <i>Contd.</i>	449	.09	Saraitikar, J. L. 46— <i>Contd.</i>	2259	.20
	450	.05		2282	.21
	452	.08			
	453	.01	Mirzapur, J. L. 66	1033	.04
	454	.12		1034	.34
	455	.13	Bahirsarbarmangala, J. L. 42	69	.24
	463	.03		72	.23
	464	.10		73	.32
	507	.005		76	.12
	508	.35		78	.25
	509	.005		79	.03
	512	.33		80	.04
	513	.02		81	.02
	518	.10		99	.32
	519	.02		100	.005
	521	.11		219	.04
	993	.03		236	.09
	2003	.01		237	.28
	2005	.11		245	.18
	2006	.05		246	.02
	2007	.06		247	.005
	2009	.01		249	.03
	2014	.14		250	.25
	2015	.10			
	2016	.01			
	2017	.20	Rayan, J. L. 68	172	.01
	2018	.01		271	.17
	2024	.01		338	.09
	2025	.005		339	.10
	2026	.29		340	.03
	2027	.005		341	.09
	2032	.14		342	.07
	2081	.29		344	.19
	2082	.34		345	.13
	2086	.01		346	.04
	2088	.12		347	.10
	2089	.02		380	.25
	2090	.24		381	.005
	2107	.005		383	.27
	2108	.02		384	.09
	2109	.37		389	.06
	2110	.10		390	.47
	2123	.30		391	.35
	2124	.31		393	.19
	2125	.13		403	.12
	2132	.22		2217	.07
	2133	.07		2218	.31
	2134	.36		2220	.17
	2135	.02		2221	.07
	2136	.02		2232	.09
	2137	.005		2233	.15
	2139	.01		2235	.23
	2205	.10		2236	.16
	2216	.02		2237	.005
	2217	.10		2242	.09
	2218	.29		2310	.11
	2219	.50		2311	.15
	2243	.08		2312	.07
	2244	.005		2313	.07
	2245	.24		2314	.13
	2246	.20		2316	.19
	2251	.19		2317	.04
	2253	.01		2321	.31
	2256	.21		2322	.11
	2257	.23		2335	.07
	2258	.10		2336	.20

Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)	Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)
Rayan, J. L. 68— <i>Contd.</i>	2337	.01	Nari, J. L. 70— <i>Contd.</i>	2650	.08
	2338	.20		2651	.21
	2339	.03		2288	.01
	2340	.19		2289	.48
	2520	.05		2890	.18
	2525	.20		2891	.03
	2542	.04		2892	.20
	2545	.05		2900	.005
	2546	.03		2901	.12
	2547	.03		2902	.16
	2549	.04		2903	.01
	2550	.16		2906	.29
	2551	.07		2907	.01
	2552	.14		2908	.31
	2553	.01		2909	.21
	2554	.19		2913	.13
	2555	.02		2917	.07
	2556	.12		2918	.09
	2557	.05		2919	.01
	2588	.005		2920	.01
	2795	.005		2921	.005
	2796	.07		2922	.03
	2800	.29		3003	.02
	2801	.02		3004	.03
	2811	.10		3005	.17
	2836	.13		3006	.10
	2837	.07		3007	.14
	2878	.08		3008	.09
	2879	.12		3009	.05
	2891	.18		3018	.005
	2892	.08		3019	.07
	2911	.02		3020	.13
	2912	.32		3021	.13
	2913	.20		3022	.05
	2914	.005		3028	.01
	2916	.17			
	2917	.20	Kalyanpur, J. L. 71	70	.005
	2923	.04		72	.19
	2927	.02		73	.01
	2932	.005		74	.19
	2933	.10		78	.11
	2934	.02		79	.02
	2935	.17		82	.01
	2936	.08		84	.04
	2948	.24		85	.09
	2959	.005		86	.11
	2950	.27		105	1.16
	2951	.18		182	.12
	3787	.41		183	.01
	3791	.10		184	.15
				185	.15
Nari, J. L. 70	1722	.02		186	.10
	1723	.21		187	.10
	1724	.05			
	1725	.005	Dangachha, J. L. 73.	117	.07
	2424	.09		127	.10
	2588	.01		128	.03
	2589	.07		129	.24
	2590	.12		131	.02
	2607	.04		143	.03
	2608	.19		144	.20
	2635	.38		145	.13
	2636	.05		148	.07
	2637	.14		149	.08
	2648	.10		151	.01
	2649	.11		152	.13

Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)	Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)
Dangachha, J.L. 73— <i>contd.</i>	180	.11	Gangapur, J.L. 88— <i>contd.</i>	1289	.06
	181	.01		1363	.30
	182	.18		1364	.22
	183	.08		1388	.21
	185	.01		1389	.13
	190	.08		1390	.10
	191	.005		1391	.03
	192	.05		1397	.11
	194	.11		1398	.15
	195	.23		1399	.19
	197	.09		1415	.15
	203	.16		1416	.14
	204	.01		1417	.12
	206	.11		1418	.04
	317	.02		1419	.11
	318	.13		1420	.08
	319	.09		1437	.08
	320	.07		1438	.17
	321	.05		1439	.12
	380	.23		1460	.19
	381	.14		1461	.17
	382	.11		1463	.21
	386	.24		1464	.06
	387	.25		1467	.27
	389	.19		1468	.17
	406	.04		1508	.21
Bamchandapur, J.L. 74	1055	.15	swathagarria, J.L. 92	45	.39
	1056	.005		46	.10
				47	.01
Gangpur, J.L. 88	78	.25		48	.34
	81	.01		49	.19
	82	.09		52	.10
	83	.01		53	.30
	84	.06		54	.005
	85	.13		55	.04
	86	.12		84	.03
	91	.43		86	.12
	106	.05		87	.05
	107	.14		88	.02
	108	.005		361	.10
	110	.12			
	111	.09	Joteram, J.L. 89	177	.005
	1198	.16		179	.09
	1213	.005		180	.28
	1214	.02		181	.07
	1215	.03		182	.05
	1216	.23		215	.15
	1230	.01		218	.12
	1259	.09		222	.30
	1260	.10		224	.09
	1261	.03		226	.28
	1262	.03		248	.03
	1264	.11		249	.09
	1265	.03		250	.26
	1266	.04		252	.11
	1267	.13		253	.23
	1268	.17		254	.15
	1272	.25		260	.14
	1273	.13		272	.14
	1274	.11		274	.15
	1275	.05		1172	.06
	1282	.005			
	1285	.03	Durgabati, J. L. 90	459	.29
	1286	.05		463	.43
	1288	.17		464	.06

Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)	Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)
Durgabati, J.L. 90 —contd	532	.34	Amra, J. L. 156 —contd	1608	.25
	533	.17		1609	.14
	535	.14		1610	.08
	536	.005		1687	.03
	538	.13		1688	.03
	539	.17		1689	.02
	540	.005		1690	.13
	1272	.33		1691	.15
	1276	.27		1698	.07
	1277	.05		1699	.10
	1280	.11		1700	.10
	1281	.13		1701	.02
	1282	.14		1702	.02
	1283	.11		1705	.02
				1706	.04
				1707	.15
Kandarsona, J.L. 86	1515	.25		1708	.03
	1516	.005		2023	.01
	1527	.23		2024	.14
	1528	.18		2026	.02
	1539	.08		2027	.06
	1540	.21		2028	.08
	1586	.93		2029	.12
	1587	.12		2030	.12
	1588	.07		2036	.02
	1589	.09		2037	.13
	1590	.08		2038	.13
	1591	.09		2039	.08
	1598	.13		2040	.03
	1599	.08		2041	.01
	1601	.005		2042	.09
	1678	.03		2043	.05
	1683	.02		2046	.01
	1686	.15		2047	.11
	1687	.08		2048	.16
	1688	.05		2063	.01
	1705	.48		2109	.04
	1712	.15		2110	.35
	1715	.25		2114	.23
	1718	.18		2115	.32
	1719	.07		2118	.21
	1720	.03		2147	.07
	1781	.17		2148	.17
	1782	.16		2149	.09
	1786	.09		2151	.11
	1787	.16		2152	.14
				2154	.09
Amra, J. L. 156	47	.17		2669	.06
	48	.08	Saktigarh, J.L. 155	81	.01
	49	.13		82	.02
	50	.10		87	.21
	57	.10		88	.09
	58	.22		91	.02
	60	.10		100	.02
	61	.21		101	.12
	62	.03		102	.08
	71	.11		134	.11
	1585	.30		135	.13
	1586	.11		141	.03
	1587	.11		143	.03
	1588	.07		145	.02
	1590	.04		146	.02
	1603	.16		147	.03
	1604	.02		148	.06
	1605	.16		149	.05
	1606	.24		151	.13
	1607	.05			

Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)	Village	Survey No. (Plot No.)	Extent (Area)
Saktigarh, J.L. — 155	152	.08	Putunda, J.L. 154—(Contd)	1855	.15
	153	.06		2148	.12
	299	.36		2149	.01
	300	.18		2153	.02
				2154	.03
Putunda, J.L. 154	1535	.07		2155	.24
	1536	.04		2156	.12
	1537	.10		2157	.12
	1539	.20		2161	.005
	1542	.05		2170	.005
	1543	.07		2171	.03
	1547	.03		2172	.11
	1548	.05		2173	.26
	1549	.12		2203	.04
	1550	.06		2204	.04
	1551	.10		2208	.02
	1552	.02		3407	.01
	1554	.12		3408	.03
	1555	.05		3409	.07
	1556	.02		3410	.16
	1559	.06		3411	.27
	1562	.12		3440	.01
	1563	.13		3441	.24
	1564	.14		3442	.16
	1565	.05		3443	.12
	1566	.05		3444	.05
	1567	.05		3454	.02
	1568	.06		3455	.09
	1569	.19		3456	.24
	1573	.005		3457	.05
	1576	.20		3458	.12
	1577	.05		3459	.06
	1578	.09		3518	.06
	1584	.08		3519	.02
	1585	.06		3520	.01
	1586	.005		3526	.06
	1594	.32		3527	.21
	1595	.25		3528	.26
	1596	.16		3529	.11
	1597	.08		3530	.08
	1598	.03		3531	.07
	1612	.02		3532	.06
	1819	.16		3578	.10
	1821	.19		3579	.10
	1823	.12		3580	.09
	1827	.16		3581	.08
	1828	.04		3583	.005
	1848	.01		3584	.21
	1849	.25		3587	.01
	1850	.15		3595	.005
	1853	.26		3597	.02
	1854	.06			

[No. 31/33/63-ONG.]

ERRATUM

New Delhi, the 9th December, 1963

S.O. 3511.—In the Schedule to the notification of the Government of India, Ministry of Mines & Fuel S.O. 2126 dated 5th August, 1963, published in the Gazette of India, Part II Section 3 and section (ii) dated 17th August, 1963.

In village Baghnadih, Thana No. 490 (Thana Madhupur)

against Survey No. 77 read "0.42" for "0.40"

Do.	Do.	Do.	No. 69 read "0.20" for "0.19"
Do.	Do.	Do.	No. 361 read "0.14" for "0.12"
Do.	Do.	Do.	No. 385 read "0.02" for "0.015"
Do.	Do.	Do.	No. 456 read "0.07" for "0.06"
Do.	Do.	Do.	No. 470 read "0.06" for "0.02"

In village Nawadilh, Thana No. 488 (Thana Madhupur)
 against Survey No. 702 read "0.03" for "0.02"
 Do. Do. Do. No. 752 read "0.06" for "0.05"
 Do. Do. Do. No. 761 read "0.09" for "0.08"

In village Bhitla, Thana No. 508 (Thana Madhupur)
 against Survey No. 267 read "0.025" for "0.01"
 Do. Do. Do. No. 373 read "0.03" for "0.015"
 Do. Do. Do. No. 402 read "0.14" for "0.11"
 Do. Do. Do. No. 406 read "0.07" for "0.035"
 Do. Do. Do. No. 408 read "0.04" for "0.03"
 Do. Do. Do. No. 432 read "0.25" for "0.13"
 Do. Do. Do. No. 403 read "0.06" for "0.05"
 Do. Do. Do. No. 369 read "0.03" for "0.01"

In village Barojora Thana No. 534 (Thana Madhupur)
 against Survey No. 214 read "0.095" for "0.08"

In village Chaparia Thana No. 565 (Thana Madhupur)
 against Survey No. 211 read "0.235" for "0.225"
 Do. Do. Do. No. 206 read "0.315" for "0.305"
 Do. Do. Do. No. 364 read "0.235" for "0.215"

In village Tekra Thana No. 566 (Thana Madhupur)
 against Survey No. 2355 read "0.065" for "0.035"

In village Nayakkak Thana No. 587 (Thana Madhupur)
 against Survey No. 99 read "0.015" for "0.005"

[No. 31/47/63-ONG]

S.O. 3512.—In the Schedule to the notification of the Government of India, Ministry of Mines and Fuel S.O. 2130, dated the 5th August, 1963 published in the Gazette of India Part II Section 3 Sub-section (ii) dated the 17th August, 1963.

In village Nawadilh Durgapur, Thana No. 12 (Sardari Circle Pindari),
 Do. Against Survey No. 24 read "0.305" for "0.24"
 Do. Against Survey No. 28 read "0.065" for "0.02"
 Do. Against Survey No. 93A read "0.24" for "0.105"
 Do. Against Survey No. 194 read "0.10" for "0.07"
 Do. Against Survey No. 340 read "0.03" for "0.01"
 Do. Against Survey No. 172 read "0.37" for "0.27"

In village Kasitanr Thana No. 26 (Sardari Circle Pindari),
 Do. Against Survey No. 98 read "0.27" for "0.25"
 Do. Against Survey No. 271 read "0.015" for "0.01"
 Do. Against Survey No. 485 read "0.16" for "0.14"
 Read Survey No. 34A against extent "0.14" for Survey No. "34" and read Survey No. 34B against extent "0.065" for Survey No. 34.

In village Jasaidih Thana No. 27 (Sardari Circle Pindari)
 Against Survey No. 1691 read "0.83" for "0.75"

In village Karmatanr Thana No. 11 (Sardari Circle Pindari),
 Do. Against Survey No. 9 read "0.16" for "0.15"
 Do. Against Survey No. 390A read "0.50" for "0.48"
 Do. Against Survey No. 382 read "0.21" for "0.20"
 Do. Against Survey No. 363 read "0.40" for "0.38"
 Do. Against Survey No. 351 read "0.12" for "0.10"
 Do. Against Survey No. 313 read "0.11" for "0.10"
 Do. Against Survey No. 1037 read "0.14" for "0.13"
 Do. Against Survey No. 580 read "0.15" for "0.14"
 Do. Against Survey No. 1601 read "0.17" for "0.13"
 Do. Against Survey No. 1598 read "0.21" for "0.05"
 Do. Against Survey No. 1711 read "0.24" for "0.18"
 Do. Against Survey No. 285 read "0.02" for "0.01"

In village Karmatanr Thana No. 11 (Sardari Circle Pindari)

Do. Against Survey No. 287 read "0.02" for "0.01"
 Do. Against Survey No. 578 read "0.08" for "0.07"
 Do. Against Survey No. 619 read "0.01" for "0.005"
 Do. Against Survey No. 1769 read "0.04" for "0.02"
 Do. Against Survey No. 1735 read "0.12" for "0.105"
 Do. Against Survey No. 345 read "0.04" for "0.03"
 Do. Against Survey No. 288 read "0.13" for "0.11"
 Do. Against Survey No. 612 read "0.09" for "0.07"
 Do. Against Survey No. 1755 read "0.20" for "0.16"
 Read Survey No. 1741A for Survey No. 174A.

In village Sugapahari Thana No. 42 (Sardari Circle Pindari)

Read Survey No. 376 extent "0.075" for Survey No. 576
 extent 007 acres.

Do. Read Survey No. 390 A against extent "0.055" for "390"
 and read Survey No. 390B against "0.035"
 for "390".

In village Dewalbari Thana No. 47 (Sardari Circle Kalajharia)

69
 Against Survey No. 431 read "0.02" for "0.015"
 Against Survey No. 353 read "0.23" for "0.21"
 Against Survey No. 435 read "0.18" for "0.16"
 Against Survey No. 349 read "0.46" for "0.44"

In village Rampur Madhopur Thana No. 49 (Sardari Circle Kalajharia)

Against Survey No. 656 read "0.05" for "0.04"

1171
 Against Survey No. 651 read "0.05" for "0.04"
 Against Survey No. 562 read "0.10" for "0.045"
 Against Survey No. 563 read "0.07" for "0.05"
 Against Survey No. 564 read "0.10" for "0.08"
 Against Survey No. 619 read "0.035" for "0.02"
 Against Survey No. 28 read "0.22" for "0.17"
 Against Survey No. 1167 read "0.035" for "0.025"
 Against Survey No. 661 read "0.255" for "0.22"
 Against Survey No. 507 read "0.205" for "0.175"
 Against Survey No. 25 read "0.05" for "0.04"

(No. 31/47/63-ONG.)

B. SUBBA RAO, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING

ORDERS

New Delhi, the 10th December 1963

S.O. 3513.—In pursuance of the Directions issued under the provisions of each of the enactments specified in the First Schedule annexed hereto, the Central Government after considering the recommendations of the Film Advisory Board Bombay, hereby approves the films specified in column 2 of the Second Schedule annexed hereto in Marathi to be of the description specified against each in column 6 of the said Second Schedule.

THE FIRST SCHEDULE

1. Sub-Section (4) of the Section 12 and Section 16 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (Central Act XXXVII of 1952).
2. Sub-Section (3) of Section 5 and Section 9 of the Bombay Cinemas (Regulation) Act, 1953 (Bombay Act XI of 1953).
3. Sub-Section (4) of Section 5 and Section 9 of the Saurashtra Cinemas (Regulation) Act, 1953 (Saurashtra Act XVII of 1953).

THE SECOND SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Title of the film	Length 35mm	Name of the applicant	Name of the producer	Whether a scientific film or a film intended for educational purposes or a film dealing with news and current events or a documentary film.
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Navin Nivasthane	290m	Films Officer, Directorate of Publicity, Government of Maharashtra, Bombay.	Film intended for educational purposes (for release in Maharashtra State only).	
2.	Maharashtra Sant Darshan	343m			
3.	Special class	249m			

[No. 24/1/63-FP App. 881.]

S.O. 3514.—In pursuance of the Directions issued under the provisions of each of the enactments specified in the First Schedule annexed hereto, the Central Government after considering the recommendations of the Film Advisory Board, Bombay, hereby approves the films specified in column 2 of the Second Schedule annexed hereto in Gujarati to be of the description specified against each in column 6 of the said Second Schedule.

THE FIRST SCHEDULE

- (1) Sub-Section (4) of the Section 12 and Section 16 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 (Central Act XXXVII of 1952).
- (2) Sub-Section (3) of Section 5 and Section 9 of the Bombay Cinemas (Regulation) Act, 1953 (Bombay Act XI of 1953).
- (3) Sub-Section (4) of Section 5 and Section 9 of the Saurashtra Cinemas (Regulation) Act, 1953 (Saurashtra Act XVII of 1953).

THE SECOND SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Title of the film	Length 35mm	Name of the applicant	Name of the producer	Whether a scientific film or a film intended for educational purposes or a film dealing with news and current events or a documentary film
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Mahitichitra No. 38	266.70m	Director of Information, Government of Gujarat, Ahmedabad.	Information, Government of Gujarat, Ahmedabad.	Film dealing with news and current events (for release in Gujarat State only).
2.	Sonano Suraj	285.29m	Do.	Do.	Film intended for educational purposes (for release in Gujarat State only).

[No. 24/1/63-FP App. 882.]

D. R. KHANNA, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF LABOUR & EMPLOYMENT

New Delhi, the 9th December 1963

S.O. 3515.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Bombay in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to Bombay Port Trust and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 5th December, 1963.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT BOMBAY

REFERENCE No. CGIT-27 OF 1963

Employers in relation to the Bombay Port Trust

AND

Their workmen.

PRESENT:

APPEARANCES: Shri Salim M. Merchant, Presiding Officer.

For the workmen.—Representing the Bombay Port Trust General Workers' Union, Shri S. Maitra, General Secretary, Representing the Bombay Port Trust Employees' Union, Dr. Shanti G. Patel, General Secretary and Shri S. K. Shetye, Assistant Secretary.

For the Employers.—Shri S. D. Nariman, Legal Advisor, Bombay Port Trust.

INDUSTRY: Port & Docks.

STATE: Maharashtra.

Bombay, the 30th November 1963

AWARD

The Central Government, by the Ministry of Labour and Employment's order No. 28/40/63-LRIV dated 19th June 1963, made on a joint application dated 24th May 1963, of the Bombay Port Trust and the Bombay Port Trust General Workers' Union, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 10 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (Act XIV of 1947), was pleased to refer the industrial dispute between the parties above-named, to me for adjudication. The subject matter of the dispute as stated in the joint application of the Bombay Port Trust and the Bombay Port Trust General Workers' Union is as follows:—

"Whether having regard to the facts of the case, the reversion of Shri Tatya Goya, Lascar, 1st Class, was justified taking into account all the provisions of para 31 of the Award in Reference No. CGIT. 5 of 1957 and the requirements of Trustees Resolution No. 296 of 1949? If such reversion is held to be unjustified, what relief, if any, is Shri Tatya Goya entitled to?"

2. After the reference was made, the General Secretary of the B.P.T. General Workers' Union, Bombay, filed his written statement dated 3/4th July 1963, to which the Bombay Port Trust filed its reply dated 31st July 1963 after which the dispute was fixed for hearing on 3rd September 1963, when after being part heard, it was adjourned by consent to 7th September 1963 for further hearing. However, on 6th September 1963, the Assistant Secretary of the Bombay Port Trust Employees' Union filed a written application asking for his Union being added as a party to the proceedings and for time to file its written statement. I heard the submissions of the parties on this application at the adjourned hearing of the dispute on 7th September 1963, when Shri S. Maitra, General Secretary of the Bombay Port Trust General Workers' Union opposed Shri Shetye's application for adjournment. Shri Nariman of the Port Trust rightly took a neutral attitude and left it to the Tribunal to decide whether to grant Shri Shetye's application or not. It is not disputed by the Bombay Port Trust General Workers' Union that the Bombay Port Trust Employees' Union represents a substantial section of the workmen who are concerned in this dispute, and that it is also a registered union. It was, therefore, entitled to represent its members at the hearing and it was not necessary formally to add that union as a party to the dispute. I was, however, not satisfied that the Bombay Port Trust Employees' Union had shown sufficient diligence in the matter and, therefore, did not grant adjournment of the hearing sought for by it, but heard the submissions of Shri Shetye, the Assistant Secretary of the Union on 7th September 1963, after which the hearing was concluded.

3. It appears that the workmen, Tatyā Goya, was appointed as a seacunney on the dredger 'Chelura' on 7th February 1963, after he had obtained Syrang's certificate on 31st January 1963. On that date one Govind Jayaram was seacunney on the 'Chelura' and on the appointment of Tatyā Goya he was appointed as officiating seacunney on the dredger 'Flcningo'. It is the Bombay Port Trust's case that Govind Jayaram was senior in service to Tatyā Goya and that after the Port Trust had examined the legal position with regard to this posting in line with the directions contained in the award of the Learned Industrial Tribunal, Shri A. Das Gupta, in Reference No. 5 of 1957 and the directions contained in the award of this Tribunal on demand No. 7 in Reference No. 24 of 1960 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3(ii) dated 4th November 1961 at page 2818, it found that the promotion of Tatyā Goya and the reversion of Govind Jayaram was illegal and it was, therefore, that on 20th August 1962 Tatyā Goya, was reverted to his former post of Lascar, Grade I, and it is against this order of reversion that this industrial dispute has been raised.

4. Before proceeding to deal with the submissions of the parties I should like briefly to state the contentious raised by the union and the Port Trust in their respective written statements. The B.P.T. General Workers' Union has relied upon the directions contained in para 31 of the award of the Learned Industrial Tribunal, Shri A. Das Gupta in Reference No. CGIT-5 of 1957 (hereinafter referred to as the Das Gupta Award). In para 31 of the Das Gupta Award, it had laid down the rules of seniority for the flotilla crews of the Deputy Conservator and Chief Engineer's Department which are applicable to both steam and motor or diesel powered vessels of the Port Trust. Reliance is mainly placed by Shri Maitra on the provisions contained in rules 6 to 9 governing determination of seniority which are in the following terms:

Rule 6:

"Vacancies in such posts as are considered qualifying post or post for training for higher tests in the marine service e.g. seacunney on the deck and greaser in the engine room of the motor and diesel vessels may be filled up by men without competency certificate only for period or periods as are considered, by the departmental heads, sufficient to enable them to qualify for the test for higher posts. If the incumbents fail to obtain the competency certificate within a reasonable time they shall be reverted to the post they were in immediately before the promotion, to afford opportunities to junior workers who have the intention and capacity to qualify and to appear at the test for higher posts for which such certificates are essential."

Rule 7.

"For ascertaining comparative seniority for the purpose, the following shall be the guiding principles:

- (i) Persons possessing the required qualifications for the promotion job shall be picked up for consideration and their comparative priority shall be based on their comparative seniority as indicated below:
 - (a) Basic pay shall ordinarily determine the comparative seniority of the candidates.
 - (b) Where basic pays are equal the date of confirmation in the grade just below the promotion grade shall be the guiding factor.
 - (c) Where there is no difference in the basic pays and the lengths of service in the grade just below the promotion grade from the date of confirmation, as aforesaid, additional higher qualification shall determine the priority as indicated below:
 - (i) The candidate who possesses any such certificate shall have priority over those who have none;
 - (ii) for jobs requiring the lower certificate, the date of obtaining the certificate shall determine the priority in cases where the basic pay, length of permanent service in the grade just below the promotion grade are the same, irrespective of any consideration about any higher certificates;
 - (iii) where all these things are equal, the next higher certificate shall determine the propriety of a candidate over those who have no such higher certificate, and if more candidates than what is required have such higher certificate, the date of obtaining the higher certificate shall be the guiding factor."

Rule 8.

"Subject to the provisions in rule (6) workmen once promoted shall not be made to revert to his original post on the ground that the men senior in service has acquired the requisite qualification for the promotion subsequent to date when the vacancy occurred. This rule does not apply when the promotion is in respect of a temporary vacancy".

Rule 9. of the Das Gupta Award is as follows:—

"A man promoted temporarily to a higher job is, on reversion to his original job relegated to his original position in the seniority list. His officiating service may count to determine his priority only when all other things are equal."

5. Shri Maitra has argued that for promotion of posts requiring qualification, conditions are regulated under clauses 7 and 9 of para 31 of the Das Gupta Award. It is Shri Maitra's contention that seacunns's post is a post requiring the qualification of a seyrang's certificate and that under the Bombay Port Trust's Resolution No. 296 of 1949 (which has been specifically referred to in the terms of the order of reference and a copy of which has been annexed to the Bombay Port Trust's written statement as Annexure C.) in Appendix B, under the heading, "Scheduled Staff", Dock Crew, "dredging and other flotilla of the Chief Engineer's Department", under item No. 6 for the 9 posts of seacunns's on the various dredgers, the minimum qualifications are shown as possession of a seyrang's certificate. Shri Maitra relies heavily upon this qualification and his emphasis is that no appointment could be made to the post of a seacunnn on a dredger, without the workman possessing a seyrang's certificate, and his case is that for the purpose of promotion to the post of seacunnn conditions are regulated under clauses 6 to 9 in para 31 of the Das Gupta Award. But to proceed with Shri Maitra's written statement, he has submitted that there had been various difficulties with regard to the interpretation of rule 8 of the Das Gupta Award and that the union by its letter dated 23rd June 1960 had demanded that "the assurance given by the Chairman to bring on the permanent schedule the employees working on the Chief Engineer's Flotilla, who had put in more than one year's service be implemented forthwith and the employee concerned be declared as permanent". To this the Chairman replied by his letter No. P. U. G. E E-G(U)/1145 dated 23rd June 1960 that, the question as to how many posts sanctioned for the second shift working on the dredger can be made permanent is being actively considered by the Chief Engineer; that the decision in the matter was rendered difficult on account of the uncertainty in regard to the future dredging programme; that the non-scheduled staff appointed to the temporary posts in question get all the service benefits admissible to non-scheduled permanent staff on the completion of one year's continuous service and that their interests are safeguarded by the fact that appointment to these posts, excepting in leave vacancies, are not considered as appointments in "temporary vacancies" for purposes of clause 8, of para 31 of the Das Gupta Award. It has also been demanded by the union under its letter dated 23rd June 1960, on demand No. 6, that the departmental orders of the Deputy Conservator placing all vacancies in the deck crews as temporary resulting in reversion of men holding permanent posts to lower posts be cancelled forthwith. The Port Trust in their said letter dated 23rd June 1960, replying to that demand stated *inter alia* that the correct interpretation of the term temporary vacancy used in sub-clause 8 of para 31 of the Industrial Tribunal's Award in Reference No. CGIT-5 of 1957, had been brought to the notice of the Port Dept. and the reversion which had taken place in that department were being re-examined in the light of this opinion. According to Shri Maitra's written statement, the Port Trust Administration by the said letter dated 23rd June 1960 had set at rest the anomaly and had decided that the term temporary vacancy used in rule 8 in the Das Gupta Award could be interpreted to mean only appointment against leave vacancy and not temporary vacancy of longer duration or temporary vacancy caused by the creation of a temporary post.

6. Shri Maitra in his written statement has also relied upon the statement of the Bombay Port Trust made before the classification & Categorisation Committee at page 46, serial No. 110, that the duties and responsibilities of seacunns of the dredging and workshop flotilla are, "to assist Masters and Mates in navigation and supervision of deck crew" and that the qualifications needed for the posts of seacunnn is the seyrang's certificate and the method of recruitment is by promotion from fiddal on the basis of seniority and suitability. The union has also drawn attention to the fact that prior to the revision of pay under the recommendations of the Classification and Categorisation Committee, the pay-scale for seacunns in the dredging and work-shop flotillas was Rs. 70—3—85 as against Rs. 60—2—70

for seacunnys in the Port Department under the Deputy Conservator who were doing out-door work as helmsmen. Shri Maitra has also relied upon the recommendations of the Classification and Categorisation Committee which in its report recommended the scale of Rs. 70—3—80, which was available to seacunnys of the Dredging Flotilla should in future be Rs. 60—5/2—75 for those not required to possess the seyrang's certificate and Rs. 75—3—105 for those required to have seyrang's certificate; that the Classification and Categorisation Committee while dealing with the seacunnys of the Deputy Conservator's Dept. at page 55 under item 481 dealing with the old scale of pay Rs. 60—2—70 had prescribed that the new scales should be Rs. 60—5/2—75. This was prescribed by the Port Trust as the seacunnys of that department were not required to hold any seyrang's certificate. According to Shri Maitra, the Port Trust Administration had wrongly fixed the scale of pay of the seacunnys working under the Dredging Flotilla at Rs. 50—75 instead of Rs. 75—105, and consequently the matter was represented on 28th September 1962 to the Administration and the Administration by its letter dated 27th February 1963 informed this union, as also the other union, that the higher scale of Rs. 75—3—105 had been prescribed by the Classification and Categorisation Committee for those who are required to possess the seyrang's certificate, and the other scale, viz., Rs. 60—5/2—75 had been prescribed for those who are not required to possess a seyrang's certificate. The Union has also quoted the following extract from the Administration's letter of 27th February 1963:

"In order to regularise matters, it has now been decided to allow the uncertificated seacunnies referred to above to retain the scale of pay of Rs. 75—3—105 as a personal concession for a maximum period of 18 months during which they would be required to obtain a seyrang's certificate. If they fail to obtain the requisite certificate within the stipulated time, they would revert to their substantive post as per Award in reference No. CGIT-24 of 1960, and if continued as temporary seacunnies, they would be brought on the lower scale prescribed for the uncertificated seacunnies. The period of 18 months will be computed from the expiry of three weeks from the date the notice to the above effect has been served on the men concerned."

7. Relying on this position taken up by the Port Trust, Shri Maitra, in his written statement has urged that seacunnys working on the dredging flotilla are required to hold seyrang's certificate and, therefore, it was the case of the union that the condition of service of the post of seacunny on the dredging flotilla cannot be governed under rule 6 of para 31 of the Das Gupta Award and that persons who are promoted to the posts of seacunnies against permanent vacancies on the Dredging Flotilla are required under the Trustees' rules to hold a seyrang's certificate and cannot be considered as such for the purposes of rule 6 of para 31 of the Das Gupta Award.

8. The union has urged that Tatya Goya was holding a seyrang's certificate and by virtue of that fact he was promoted to the seacunny's post on 7th February 1963. He has stated that as Govind Jayaram did not hold a seyrang's certificate on 19th February 1963, he could not under the Trustees' Resolution No. 296 of 1949 be promoted to the post of seacunny on the Dredging Flotilla by the demotion of Tatya Goya. He has also urged that the Post Trust could not have given acting promotion in place of Jayaram to one Shri Abdulla Baba who also did not hold a seyrang's certificate and that the acting promotion so given was also wrong. He had also argued that under the Trustees' Resolution No. 362 of 1921 and T.R. No. 296 of 1949, Lascar, 1st Class is required to hold a seyrang's certificate for promotion to the post of seacunny and that the Port Trust Administration in their statement filed before the Classification and Categorisation Committee had also officially indicated that the qualification needed for the promotion of a seacunny on the Dredging Flotilla, was holding of a seyrang's certificate. He has, therefore, urged that Tatya Goya who held a seyrang's certificate was correctly promoted to the post of seacunny on 7th February 1963; that as he was promoted against a permanent post of seacunny on the Dredging Flotilla, therefore, his demotion cannot be effected under rule 8 of the para 31 of the Das Gupta Award. He has further argued that as seacunnys on the Dredging Flotilla under the rules of the Trustees are required to hold seyrang's certificates, promotion to the permanent post of seacunny cannot be regulated under rule 6 of the Das Gupta Award. Shri Maitra has also relied upon the terms of settlement recorded by the Port Trust and his union on demand No. 6 in the Industrial Dispute Reference No. 24 of 1960, where upon the union wanting an assurance that the reversions that has been set aside by the Port Trust should not be reopened for reversion or demotion subject to clause 8 of the para 31 of the Das Gupta Award, it was stated on behalf

of the Port Trust by its Legal Adviser, Shri Nariman that the reversions that has been set aside under the settlement would not be reopened and that was recorded as a part of the award on that issue. Shri Maitra has argued that this showed that the Port Trust Administration had agreed to treat the promotion to vacancies which are not purely leave vacancies as outside the scope of clause 8 of para 31 of the Das Gupta Award and as such it was not understood why the promotion to the post of seacunny given to Tatyā Goya should be considered as governed under rule 6 of para 31 of the Das Gupta Award. Shri Maitra has argued that Tatyā Goya's promotion to the permanent post of seacunny was according to the requirements as laid down in the Resolution No. 296 of 1949 and that having once been promoted to the post of seacunny on the Dredging Flotilla he was protected by the terms of settlement recorded in demand No. 6 in Reference No. CGIT-24 of 1960 and that he was further protected by the qualifications laid down for the post of seacunny by the Classification and Categorisation Committee. The union has, therefore, submitted that reversion of Tatyā Goya from the post of seacunny to that of Lascar, 1st Class, should be held as unjustified and Tatyā Goya should be directed to be reinstated to the post of seacunny with retrospective effect from 19th February 1963.

9. The Bombay Port Trust in its written statement has given an account of how this dispute came into existence. It appears that in February 1962, the union raised a dispute on the plea that on the Dredgers 'Chelura' and 'Vikas' seacunnies were required to supervise the operation of the cranes and to stand on the deck throughout the period of the operation of the dredging. The union protested against the alleged supervision of dredging being required to be done by the seacunnies and threatened that unless this grievance was removed the members of the union would go on strike. The Port Trust appears to have pointed out in the discussions that followed that when the dredging operation were in progress, the Mate, 2nd grade, and not the seacunny as mentioned by the union, kept an eye on the cranes and when he noticed that the silt was not coming up he gave a signal to the winch-man to heave the winch so that the dredger might move further; that it will hardly be considered as supervision of the dredging operations as stated by the union and that the same was the legitimate work of the Mate which he had been performing for a long time and that it was the practice for a lascar to relieve the Mate when necessary during the operation. The union thereupon, promptly raised a dispute that a lascar should not be asked to relieve a Mate and insisted on this being regularised. Though such a demand was considered as purely obstructive, the Executive Engineer suggested the creation of a seacunny's post for giving relief to the Mate, surrendering one post of Lascar 1st Grade. The Bombay Port Trust has annexed to its written statement the correspondence on the subject at pages 11 and 13 of its written statement. Now, as it happened, the Lascars, 1st Grade, were members not of the B.P.T. General Workers' Union but of the Bombay Port Trust Employee's Union and as the posts of Lascar 1st Grade were proposed to be refrenched, the matter was discussed by the Executive Engineer with an officer of that union, Shri Deshmukh, who later agreed to the suggestion of the Executive Engineer referred to above. Thereupon, the Chief Engineer, by his letter dated 3rd October 1962, addressed a letter to the Secretary requesting the sanction for the creation of four permanent posts of seacunnies two each for the Dredgers, 'Chelura' and 'Vikas' and abolition of equal number of permanent posts of lascars 1st grade. But even before the posts could be sanctioned by the Board the two posts for the 'Vikas' and two for the 'Chelura' came to be operated with effect from the 1st day of December 1962 and the 28th day of December, 1962, respectively. It appears that Sarvashri Vasudev Umaji and Pandurang Sawlaram, both holding the substantive posts of Lascars, 1st Grade, and not possessing a seyrang's certificate were posted as temporary seacunnies on the 'Vikas' and Sarvashri Abdulla Baba and Govind Jairam also holders of substantive posts of Lascars, 1st Grade and not holding a seyrang's certificate were posted as temporary seacunnies on the 'Chelura', all the said four postings having been made on the basis of seniority. According to the Post Trust, Tatyā Goya, who also holds the substantive post of Lascar, 1st Grade and is junior to Shri Govind Jairam, obtained the seyrang's certificate on 31st January 1963. Thereupon the Senior Dredging Master posted Tatyā Goya as a temporary seacunny on the Chelura in the place of the said Govind Jairam. The Senior Dredging Master by his memo dated 8th/11th February 1963 addressed to the Executive Engineer, Dredging, reported the said arrangement. The Executive Engineer thereupon raised a query whether the said arrangement was in accordance with the existing rules and practice, pointing out that Tatyā Goya would actually supersede about 100 other lascars and that Shri Deshmukh of the Bombay Port Trust Employees' Union had objected to this promotion. The Bombay Port Trust has annexed to its written statement copies of the said memo, dated 8/11th February 1963 of the Senior Dredging Master and the noting of the Executive Engineer, Dredging,

dated 12th February 1963 as annexure B to its written statement. Thereupon, the employers, on a proper consideration of the matter, decided to restore Govind Jairam as a temporary seacunny on the Chelura reverting Tatya Goya with effect from 20th February 1963. According to the Port Trust, the Senior Dredging Master, in posting Tatya Goya and reverting Govind Jairam by reason of Tatya Goya having subsequently obtained a seyrang's certificate had ignored the superior claim of lascars who had greater seniority of service and who in terms of the Das Gupta Award were eligible for appointment to that post to enable them to obtain the necessary service qualification to appear for the test for the sevrang's certificate. According to the Port Trust, the directions in clause 6 of para 31 of the Das Gupta Award provided a complete answer to the present dispute. It is pointed out that the Das Gupta Award having directed that the said posts be filled by men without competency certificate only for a period or periods as are considered necessary, a further dispute arose as regards the period within which the men should be required to obtain the competency certificate in default of which under the said direction they were liable to be reverted to their substantive posts. The Port Trust has pointed out that this fresh dispute formed the subject matter of Demand No. 7 in the industrial dispute Reference No. CGIT-24 of 1960 which was heard and decided by this Tribunal. The Bombay Port Trust has pointed that the union in its statement of claim on Demand No. 7 in the said industrial dispute Reference No. 24 of 1960 had not only asserted the right of the 1st class lascars to work as seacunnies in order to enable them to appear for the necessary competency certificate but had also demanded that they should be allowed to continue in the posts till they had at least three chances for appearing for examination and should not be reverted after one year; that the union in its said statement of claim referred to the agreement arrived at between the union and the employers to the effect that "the 1st class lascar who is promoted to act as seacunny and who fails to obtain a sevrang's certificate in his first attempt should be allowed to serve as a seacunny for a total period not exceeding 18 months before being reverted"; that the Tribunal in the said dispute had recorded the said settlement and had further observed that at the hearing it was agreed by the parties that the direction should be that a person who had completed qualifying service in the post of seacunny which would enable him to appear for a test will be reverted if he fails to appear for the test within a fortnight from the date of the completion of the qualifying period except for reasons beyond his control, and the Tribunal had directed accordingly. The Port Trust has submitted that the directions contained in the Das Gupta Award clearly and unequivocally provided for 1st class lascars, without any competency certificate being initially appointed to the post of seacunny subject to their being reverted, if they should fail to obtain the necessary certificate within a reasonable period and that the reasonable period for obtaining the certificate has now, as stated above, been settled by the Award of this Tribunal on Demand No. 7 in Reference No. CGIT-24 of 1960, as being a period not exceeding 18 months. The Port Trust has contended that the directions contained in the Das Gupta Award and in the Award of this Tribunal on Demand No. 7 in Reference No. 24 of 1960 established completely and beyond dispute the right of the 1st class lascars without any competency certificate to be promoted to the post of seacunny on the basis of seniority of service. The Port Trust has also relied upon the fact that the union in its statement of claim on another demand being demand No. 22 in the said industrial dispute, Reference No. CGIT-24 of 1960, while seeking creation of two posts of seacunnies had observed that such posts if created would provide opportunities for senior lascars to secure service of working and appearing for higher competency certificate and had further observed that the creation of such posts is the means which can provide adequate opportunities to the men to acquire necessary service required for qualification certificate. The Port Trust has submitted that the posting by the Senior Dredging Master of Tatya Goya as seacunny on the Chelura in temporary capacity on the basis of his holding a seyrang's certificate reverting Govind Jairam and ignoring the claim under the said two Awards of several 1st class lascars senior to Tatya Goya was a mistake and fell foul of the provisions contained in the said Awards and it was clearly incumbent on them to rectify the said mistake by reverting Tatya Goya to his substantive post and providing opportunity to a 1st class Lascar on the basis of seniority of service to enable him to qualify for appearing at the test for competency certificate. With regard to the Management's letter dated 23rd June 1960, the Port Trust has contended that the assurance contained in that letter and relied upon by the union apart from having no relevance on the present issue was exclusively in connection with posts which had been sanctioned on a temporary basis for the second shift working on the dredgers in view of the uncertainty in regard to the future dredging programme. It has urged that the said assurance governed the particular case and was based on considerations which do not obtain in the present case. The Port Trust has submitted that the question whether the postings

referred to were on permanent or temporary basis does not arise at all on the facts of the present case seeing that the reversion of Tatya Goya was only on the basis that posting him as a seacunny, ignoring the claims of several other 1st class Lascars senior to him in service was evidently a breach of the direction contained in the Award referred to above. Referring to the fact that the union in its statement of claim had referred to demand No. 6 in an attempt to establish that Tatya Goya could not be said to have been appointed in "a temporary vacancy within the meaning sub-clause (8) of para 31 of Das Gupta Award", the Port Trust has pointed out that the Award itself expressly lays down that the provisions of clause 8 are subject to the provisions in rule 6 which contains principles governing promotion to the posts of seacunnies. It has submitted that quite apart from the fact that rule 8 has in express terms been made subject to rule 6, it has no relevance whatsoever on the facts of the case considering Tatya Goya was not made to revert to his original post on the ground that the men senior in service had acquired the requisite qualification for promotion subsequent to the date when the vacancy occurred; that the reversion was not on the ground of another employee with longer service having acquired the requisite qualification subsequent to the posting of Tatya Goya as a seacunny, but solely on the consideration that in making the said posting the Senior Dredging Master has fallen into an error and ignored the provisions of the Das Gupta Award which is further clarified by the award of this Tribunal on demand No. 7 in Reference No. 24 of 1960. On these submissions it is contended that the employers were not only justified in reverting Tatya Goya but that it was incumbent on them to do so in compliance with the provisions of the said awards and the provisions of the Trustees' Resolution No. 296 of 1949 could not prevail over the provisions of an award much less an award subsequent to the date of the said Resolution. It is pointed out that by Resolution No. 296 what had happened was that pay of categories of employees therein mentioned were revised in view of the report of the first Central Pay Commission. It is submitted that while remarks in item 9 in Appendix B showed that a seyrang's certificate is necessary for a workman to be confirmed in the post, it was not the intention that this seyrang's certificate was necessary for initial recruitment to the post on a temporary basis. It is submitted that any contention that every appointment to the post of seacunny on the Dredgers must even initially be from persons holding a seyrang's certificate would result in the patent absurdity that a man could not be appointed as a seacunny unless he held the seyrang's certificate and a seyrang's certificate cannot be obtained unless the man has served as a seacunny for the prescribed period to be qualified to appear for the test for seyrang's certificate. It is submitted that what it has urged with regard to T. R. No. 296 of 1949 also applied to the statements filed on behalf of the Bombay Port Trust for the Classification and Categorisation Committee. With regard to the letter dated 27th February 1963, addressed by the Assistant Secretary of the Port Trust to the General Secretary of the Union, the Port Trust has clarified that there were a number of uncertificated seacunnies holding temporary posts of seacunnies for which a seyrang's certificate is prescribed and that though these employees were uncertificated due to inadvertence they had been paid on the basis that they were certificated and that in that letter it was only pointed out that such seacunnies would be allowed to retain the higher scale which they were enjoying under a mistake on the part of the Administration, for a period of 18 months within which they would be required to obtain a seyrang's certificate; that this letter itself shows that seyrang's certificate was necessary before a man is confirmed in the post of seacunny but the initial recruitment on temporary basis would be of an uncertificated lascar on the basis of seniority of service, such lascar having to obtain the necessary certificate before he could be confirmed. It is finally denied that the principles laid down in rule 8 of para 31 of the Das Gupta Award could not apply to the promotion to the posts of seacunnies on the Dredgers. The said rule is entirely unqualified and draws no distinction between seacunnies on Dredgers and seacunnies on other vessels nor does the Award on Demand No. 7 in Reference No. 24 of 1960 draw any such distinction.

10. The admitted facts are that Tatya Goya was promoted as a seacunny on 7th February, 1963 and was reverted to his original post of lascar 1st Grade on 20th February, 1963. It is admitted that the lascars First Grades' Scale of Pay is Rs. 80—1—85—2—95 and at the relevant time Tatya Goya was at the stage of Rs. 84/- in that scale. The scale for seacunny's is Rs. 125—3—131—4—155. It is admitted that when Tatya Goya was promoted as seacunny, he had obtained the certificate of a seyrang and that he replaced one Govind Jayram. Now, it is the B.P.T.'s contention as also that of the B. P. T. Employees' Union that Govind Jayram was senior in service to Tatya Goya. Shri S. Moitra, does not admit this, but he has, on the other hand, not led the evidence of Tatya Goya or produced

any documentary record to establish that Tatya Goya was senior in service to Govind Jayaram. Shri S. Moitra, has sought to rely on the fact that there appears to be a certain amount of confusion regarding the recorded seniority of the workmen in the Dredger section, and on the further fact that a committee has been appointed by the Chairman to determine the seniority in service of the workmen in the Dredger Flotilla. At the hearing the B.P.T. stated that the B.P.T. had submitted a seniority list directed by the Award in Reference No. 24 of 1960, in which Govind Jayaram's rank according to seniority was 70th, whilst that of Tatya Goya was 196th. But, Shri Moitra, has challenged the corrections of this ranking and has referred to the fact of a committee for determining seniority having been appointed by the Chairman. However, Shri Shetye, the Assistant Secretary of the B.P.T. Employees' Union, who originally had represented all the workmen of the Dredger Section including Tatya Goya, in his address challenged that if Shri S. Moitra established that Tatya Goya was senior in service to Govind Jayaram, his union would support Tatya Goya's case. But this challenge was not accepted by Shri S. Moitra, who, as I have stated earlier, has not led any evidence, oral or documentary to establish Tatya Goya's seniority in service over that of Govind Jayaram.

11. Be that as it may, according to the B.P.T., Abdulla Baba and Govind Jayaram were the first to be posted as seacunnies on the dredger "Cherula", Govind Jayaram having been posted on 26th December, 1962. It is admitted that Govind Jayaram did not have a Serang's certificate, though he had worked as seacunny on other vessels. Tatya Goya, however, obtained serang's certificate on 31st January, 1963 and on 7th February, 1963 he was promoted as seacunny, replacing Govind Jayaram, who was reverted to the post of Lascar. The B.P.T. General Employees' Union which then represented the workmen of the Dredger Flotilla, felt that Govind Jayaram had been un-fairly treated and, therefore, challenged the promotion of Tatya Goya and the consequent reversion of Govind Jayaram. The legal aspect of the question was then examined by the administration who decided that under Rule 6, the promotion of Tatya Goya was not justified, and directed his reversion to the post of Laskar 1st Grade on 20th February, 1963. Tatya Goya then appears to have approached the B.P.T. General Workers' Union who espoused his cause and raised this industrial dispute over it.

12. It is, therefore, convenient at this stage to discuss the provisions of Rules 6 and 8 governing seniority as laid down in para 31 of the Das Gupta Award in Reference No. CGIT-5 of 1957, which have been extracted supra in para 4 of this Award.

13. The first thing to be noted is that Rule 6 lays down a rule for filling in vacancies to all qualifying posts for training for higher tests in the marine service. It is in that sense a general rule and the reference to "seacunny on the deck" in that rule is illustrative. The rule permits that vacancies in such qualifying posts may be filled up by men without qualifying certificate only for period or periods as are considered, by the departmental heads, sufficient to enable them to qualify for the test for higher posts, and that if the incumbents fail to obtain the qualifying certificate within a reasonable time they would be revert to the post they were in immediately before the promotion, to offered opportunity to younger workman who have the intention and capacity to qualify for higher posts for which such certificates are essential. Now, Rule 8 specifically states that its provisions are subject to those of Rule 6, and what it provides for is that a workman once promoted shall not be made to revert to his original post on the ground that man senior in service has acquired the qualification for the promotion subsequent to the date when the vacancy occurred. Rule 8 in conclusion specifically provides that this rule does not apply when the promotion is in respect of a temporary post.

14. Now, it is necessary to state that a subsequent dispute arose as regards the period within which the men should be required to obtain the competency certificate in default of which, under the said direction, they were liable to be reverted to their substantial posts. That question formed the subject matter of demand No. 7 in the industrial dispute, Reference No. CGIT-24 of 1960, which was referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. The Union in its written statement on that demand had not only asserted the right of the first class Laskars to work as seacunnies in order to enable them to appear for the necessary competency certificate, but had also demanded that they should be allowed to continue in the posts till they had at least 2/3 chances for appearing for the qualifying examination, and could not be reverted after one year. An agreement was reached between the Bombay Port Trust and the Union to the effect that, "the 1st class lascar who is promoted to act as seacunny and who fails to obtain a serang's certificate in his first attempt should be allowed to serve as a seacunny

for a total period not exceeding 18 months before being reverted." This Tribunal, in its award on demand No. 7, in recording the said settlement, further observed that at the hearing it was agreed by the parties that the direction should be that a person who has completed qualifying service in the post of seacunny which would enable him to appear for a test, will be reverted if he fails to appear for the test within a fortnight from the date of the completion of the qualifying period except for reasons beyond his control, and the Tribunal directed accordingly.

15. The first thing to notice is that Rule 6 provides a general rule for all posts requiring qualifications and seacunny's post is only mentioned as an illustration. Shri Nariman has contended that Rule 8 is subject to Rule 6 and that where Rule 6 applies the provisions of Rule 8, cannot apply. That even assuming that Rule 8 does apply, then (as it provides that because a man senior in service subsequently acquires the necessary qualification, the incumbent cannot be replaced by him) applying this rule to the instant case it means that ones Govind Jayram was promoted to the seacunny's post, he could not be displaced by Tatya Goya, on the ground that Tatya Goya had subsequently acquired the qualification and was senior in service; that as under Rule 8 a person holding the post of seacunny could not be displaced by another who acquired the qualification subsequently though senior in service, surely Govind Jayram, who was senior in service would not be displaced by Tatya Goya who was junior in service.

16. Shri S Maitra has, however, argued that the expression "vacancies in such a post" in Rule 6 means vacancies in leave posts and that Rule 6 was provided for the purposes of promoting lascars not holding any qualification certificates against leave vacancies. His grievance is that if the Bombay Port Trust's contention were to be accepted, no lascar would be able to hold the post of seacunny permanently and the post of seacunny would always remain temporary. Shri Maitra has sought to draw a difference between the qualifications of a seacunny on a dredger flotilla and a Port Department flotilla and he has argued that because a seacunny in the latter is not required to hold any qualification certificate, the scales of pay for him is lower than for a seacunny on the Dredger Flotilla. He has relied heavily on the provisions of T.R. No. 296 of 1949, which provides that for holding the post of a seacunny one must hold a serang's certificate. He has, in this, connection referred to the recommendations of the Jeejeebhoy Committee but I do not think that a reference to the scales fixed by the Jeejeebhoy Committee for the seacunnies in the Port Department are of any help as the recommendations of that Committee do not debar lascars from qualifying as seacunnies and in any case that Committee's recommendation cannot prevail over an award. This contention loses force as in fact the Jeejeebhoy Committee's Report is dated 28th May, 1961 and my award in Reference No. 24 of 1960 is later being dated 16th October, 1961. Shri Maitra has argued that for promoting a lascar who is already holding a serang's certificate to a temporary vacancy of a seacunny which is not a leave vacancy, Rule 6 is not attracted. Shri Maitra has with some vehemance argued that non-certified lascars cannot be appointed as seacunnies because the rules provided that they should hold serang's certificates. He has argued that though a post may be temporary or provisional, yet unless it is in a leave vacancy the provisions of Rule 6 or the last part of Rule 8 will not apply. Shri Maitra in referring to the correspondence between the Port Trust and his union has referred to the former's letter of 12th March, 1963 where it was stated that Tatya Goya was promoted as acting seacunny in accordance with the practice in force even though he was junior to several others who were uncertificated men. Shri Maitra has argued that the Bombay Port Trust was trying to misinterpret the rules in order that it may not be called upon to pay the higher scale of pay for seacunnies. He has argued that if the Bombay Port Trust's contentions were to be accepted, it would only mean that the post of seacunny would always remain a training post in rotation and no lascar would be able to become permanent in it.

17. I am not impressed by the interpretation on the expression "vacancies in such posts" sought to be placed by Shri S Maitra, as meaning vacancies in leave posts. I think Shri Nariman is right when he says that if this interpretation were to be accepted it would virtually amount to rewriting the Das Gupta Award. It is significant that no such proposition was advanced in the written statement of the union. If the interpretation of Shri Maitra were to be accepted then a patent absurdity would result as no one could be appointed as seacunny on the dredger unless he had a serang's certificate. It must be remembered that Rule 6 applies to all posts which are considered as qualifying posts. It is therefore a general rule. Rule 6 provides further that on a dredger the post

of a seacunny could be filled up by men without qualification, but the qualification is that such appointments may be made by the departmental head. Rule 6 did not state within what period the qualification had to be acquired. That time was prescribed by the consent terms on demand No. 7 in Reference No. 24 of 1960. If the interpretation placed by the Bombay Port Trust were not to be accepted there would be a vicious circle inasmuch as one could not be a seacunny unless he acquired the qualification and one could not acquire the qualification unless one had acted as seacunny. Such an absurdity could only be solved by appointing outsiders who are qualified as seacunnies, which was nobody's intention, the intention being that lascars should be given an opportunity to qualify by working as seacunnies.

18. The justification of the action of the Bombay Port Trust in reverting Tatyā Goya is under the terms of the reference to be decided taking into account all the provisions of para 31 of the award in Reference No. 5 of 1957 and the requirements of Trustees' Resolution No. 296 of 1949. I have already dealt at some length with the provisions of para 31 of the award in Reference No. 5 of 1957. No doubt T.R. No. 296 of 1949 provides that qualified persons can only be appointed as seacunnies. But the conditions of service imposed by that Resolution must be held to have been altered by the terms of subsequent awards particularly by the provisions of para 31 of the award in Reference No. 5 of 1957 and the provisions of the award on demand No. 7 in Reference No. 24 of 1960.

19. I am convinced that the whole idea underlying the provisions of rule 6 was to provide an opportunity for lascars to be trained up as seacunnies and that the term "vacancies in such posts" cannot be restricted only to leave vacancies. It is significant that rule 5 which also refers to vacancies does not refer in terms to leave vacancies. The theory of appointment only in leave vacancies is further destroyed by the fact that under demand No. 7 in Reference No. 24 of 1960 the union had demanded that the persons who are given chance to qualify as seacunnies should not be reverted at the end of one year but should be given three chances. I am further not impressed by Shri Maitra's contention that the idea behind the reversion of Tatyā Goya was in effect to deprive the seacunnies being paid in the higher scale of pay prescribed for them. There is no warrant for any such ulterior motive being attributed to the management.

20. In the result, I hold that having regard to the facts of the case the reversion of Shri Tatyā Goya as Lascar 1st class was justified taking into account all the provisions of para 31 of the award in Reference No. 5 of 1957 and the requirements of Trustees' Resolution No. 296 of 1949. Tatyā Goya is therefore entitled to no relief. No order as to costs.

(Sd.) SALIM M. MERCHANT,
Presiding Officer.
[No. 28/40/63/LR.IV.]

New Delhi, the 12th December 1963

S.O. 3516.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government having regard to the location of the factory in a sparse area exempts the factory situate in the area in the State of Kerala mentioned in the Schedule below from the payment of the employers' special contribution leviable under Chapter VA of the said Act till the enforcement of the provisions of Chapter V of that Act in the said area.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Name of the District	Name of the area	Name of the factory
1	2	3	4
I.	Trichur	Vallachira	M/s Aravind Tile Works

[No. F. 6(7)/62-HI.]

S.O. 3517.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government, having regard to the location of the factory in sparse areas, hereby exempts the factory situate in the area in the State of Bihar mentioned in the Schedule below from the payment of the employers' special contribution leviable under Chapter VA of the said Act till the enforcement of the provisions of Chapter V of that Act in the said area.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Name of District	Name of the area	Name of the factory
1	2	3	4
I.	Dhanbad	Kharkharee	Kharkharee Fire Brick Works

[No. F. 6(110)/63-HI.]

S.O. 3518.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 73F of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government, having regard to the location of the factory in sparse areas, exempts the factory situate in the area in the State of Maharashtra mentioned in the Schedule below, from the payment of the employers' special contribution leviable under Chapter VA of the said Act until the enforcement of the provisions of Chapter V of that Act in that area.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Name of the District	Name of the area	Name of the factory
1	2	3	4
I.	East Khandesh	Erandol	M/s. Vikas Hath Kagad Kendra.

[No. F. 7(15)/62-HI.]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 10th December 1963

S.O. 3519.—Whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to M/s. R. Sharp & Son Private Limited, Bombay and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Bombay, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

1. Whether the management was justified in imposing the punishment of suspension from 17th October, 1963 to 26th October, 1963 coupled with warning on Shri Lalman, junior worker No. 109-G?
2. If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

[No. 28/103/63-LRIV.]

CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 12th December 1963

S.O. 3520.—In the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 1367, dated the 6th May, 1963 published at pages

1512 and 1513 in Part II, sub-section (ii) of Section 3 of the Gazette of India dated the 18th May, 1963,

At page 1573, in line 10—

for "Haddiala"
read "Hadiabad".

[No. F. 6(79)/63-HI.]
O. P. TALWAR, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 11th December 1963

S.O. 3521.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 9 of the Working Journalists (Conditions of Service) and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1955 (45 of 1955) read with sub-section (3) of section 11 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Sidheshwar Prasad, Member of Lok Sabha as a member of the Wage Board for Working Journalists to represent independent persons, in the vacancy caused by the resignation of Shri Bhakt Darshan, M.P. and makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 3202 dated the 12th November, 1963 namely:—

In the Table annexed to the said notification, against Serial No. 6, for the entry "Shri Bhakt Darshan, M.P.", the entry "Shri Sidheshwar Prasad, M.P." shall be substituted.

[No. F. 60/7/63-LRI.]

S.O. 3522.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Palana Colliery and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 27th November, 1963.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, DHANBAD

In the matter of a Reference under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

REFERENCE NO. 36 OF 1963

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to Palana Colliery

AND

Their workmen

PRESENT:

Shri Raj Koshore Prasad, M.A., B.L., Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES:

For the Employers: Shri H. C. Gupta, Manager, Palana Colliery.

For the Workmen: Dr. Jawahar Lal Ajmani, Patron, with Sri Arjun Ram, President, Palana Colliery Mazdoor Union.

STATE: Rajasthan.

INDUSTRY: Mining.

Camp: Bikaner, dated the 22nd November, 1963

AWARD

Ministry of Labour & Employment, Government of India, by its Order No. 2/126/61-LRII dated the 23rd January, 1962, referred an industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation to the Palana Colliery, Rajasthan, and its workmen in respect of the matter specified below under Section 10(1)(d) of the Act for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Jaipur, which was subsequently withdrawn from the Industrial Tribunal, Jaipur, and transferred to the Industrial Tribunal, Delhi on 18th December 1962, from where also it was subsequently withdrawn and transferred to this Tribunal on the 20th March, 1963, for disposal:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Mine Manager, Palana requiring Shri Adu Ram (son of Bhaira Ram), Chowkidar, to resume his duty as coal cutter in category V from 11th January 1961, was *malafide* and, if so, to what relief is he entitled?"

2. This reference was fixed for hearing on 23rd November 1963, at Bikaner, but both the parties represented by their respective representatives appeared before me on 21st November 1963, and filed a joint petition of compromise signed by them and prayed that an award in terms thereof be passed in this reference.

3. I have read the terms of the compromise and find that they are fair and reasonable and in the interest of both the parties, and, therefore, I accept them.

4. I, therefore, make an award in terms of the compromise dated 21st November 1963, which is marked Annexure 'A' and made a part of this award.

5. This is the award which I make and submit to the Government of India under Section 15 of the Act.

Sd/- **RAJ KISHORE PRASAD,**
Presiding Officer.

Camp: Bikaner,
dated the 22nd November, 1963.

ANNEXURE "A"

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, DHANBAD
(Camp Bikaner)

In the matter of Reference No. 36 of 1963.

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the Palana Colliery.

AND

Their workmen represented by the Palana Colliery, Mazdoor Union.

May it please the Hon'ble Tribunal

The parties concerned in the above reference No. 36 of 1963 have reached the following settlement.

The parties are agreed that the management shall withdraw their office order No. 0/11/61/60-61/8255 dated 11th January 1961 and shall allow Shri Adu Ram s/o Sri Bhaira Ram to continue as Chowkidar with continuity of service. Shri Adu Ram s/o Sh. Bhaira Ram shall be paid 50% of his wages, excluding Bonus and leave wages, for the period from 11th January 1961 to the date of signing this agreement.

Parties pray that the Award may be passed in terms of this settlement.

No order as to cost.

H. C. GUPTA,
Mine Manager,
Palana Colliery,
Palana.

Dr. JAWAHAR LAL,
Patron, Palana Colliery,
Mazdoor Union.

C. L. MATHUR,
Labour Welfare Officer,
Palana Colliery,
Palana.

ARJUN RAM,
President, Palana Colliery,
Mazdoor Union.

[No. 2/126/61-LR.II.]

New Delhi, the 12th December 1963

S.O. 3523.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Churulia Colliery, Post Office Churulia, District Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 7th December, 1963.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL: CALCUTTA
REFERENCE NO. 11 OF 1963

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the Churulia Colliery, P.O. Churulia, Dist. Burdwan
 and
 Their workmen.

PRESENT:

Shri L. P. Dave—Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of Employers—Shri B. W. Bijapur Kar, Secretary.

On behalf of Workmen—Shri Jagdish Pandey, Vice President, Colliery Mazdoor Congress.

STATE: West Bengal.

INDUSTRY: Coal Mines.

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Employment, by their order No. 6/17/63-LRII, dated 5th August 1963, have referred the industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation to the Churulia Colliery and their workmen in respect of the question whether the suspension of Shri Lakhu Sen from 23rd May 1963 to 12th June 1963 was legal and justified and if not, to what relief the workman is entitled for adjudication to this Tribunal.

2. In response to notices issued by this Tribunal, both parties filed their written statements. The matter was then fixed for hearing. At that time, after some discussions, the parties entered into a compromise and produced a memorandum containing the terms of compromise, a copy of which is appended herewith.

3. The dispute relates to the suspension of a workman named Shri Lakhu Sen for 21 days. He and three other workers were charged with assaulting one Overman. After an enquiry, the management held that the other three persons had actually assaulted the Overman while the present workman (Shri Lakhu Sen) had conspired and assisted in the said assault. The other three workmen were dismissed while the present workman was suspended for a period of 21 days. I am told that at the conciliation proceedings held in respect of the other three workmen, the matter was amicably settled. No such settlement was arrived at in respect of Shri Lakhu Sen and hence it was referred for adjudication.

4. Under the compromise, the management have agreed to pay to the workman concerned a sum of Rs. 55 for the period of suspension. As I mentioned above, the period of suspension was 21 days and the workman would have earned about Rs. 60 or so if he had not been suspended. In my opinion, the compromise is fair and reasonable. I therefore accept it.

In the result, I pass an award in terms of the compromise.

Dated 3rd December, 1963.

Sd./- L. P. DAVE,
 Presiding Officer.

(TRUE COPY)

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, 8, MADAN
 STREET, CALCUTTA-13**

REFERENCE NO. 11 OF 1963

PARTIES: Employers in relation to the Churulia Colliery
 and

Their workmen represented by Colliery Mazdoor Congress
 and

In the matter of joint petition of compromise.

The aforesaid petition most respectfully sheweth:

That the parties have mutually settled the dispute on the following terms:

1. The management agrees to make a lump sum payment of Rs. 55 (Rupees fifty five) only for the period of suspension.

2. The workman renounces all other of his claims in respect of the aforesaid dispute.
3. The payment will be made by 10th of December, 1963.
4. This determines the dispute.
5. Parties will bear their own costs.

Therefore, it is prayed jointly by the Company's and Union's representatives that an award may kindly be passed terms as above.

And for this act of kindness, the petitioners as in duty bound shall ever pray.

Sd/- **B. W. BIJAPAR KAR,**

Secretary.

Dated 3-12-1963.

Sd/- **L. S. Garg.**

Agent

for the Churulia Colliery.

L.T.I. of Lakhu Sen.

Sd/- **JAGDISH PANDEY,**
Vice President.

Dated 3-12-1963.

Sd/-

for the workmen.

[No. 6/17/63-LR.I.I]

New Delhi, the 16th December 1963

S.O. 3524.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 33CC of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 1188, dated the 15th April, 1963, namely:—

In the Table annexed to the said notification,—

(i) in the entries under column 3 against serial No. 1, for the entries "The States of Maharashtra, Rajasthan and the Union territories of Delhi, Goa, Daman and Diu and Himachal Pradesh", the entries "The State of Maharashtra and the Union Territories of Delhi, Goa, Daman and Diu and Himachal Pradesh" shall be substituted;

(ii) after serial No. 10, the following entries shall be inserted under columns 1, 2 and 3 respectively, namely:—

11. Labour Court, Jaipur, constituted under section 7 of the said Act by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment, No. S.O. 1780, dated the 19th June, 1963.	The State of Rajasthan.
--	-------------------------

[No. F. 1/63/63-LR.I.]

S.O. 3525.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 4 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment, No. S.O. 716, dated the 21st March, 1961, namely:—

In the Table annexed to the said notification in the entries relating to the State of Madhya Pradesh, after Serial No. 13A and the entries relating thereto, the following entries shall be inserted in columns 1 and 2 respectively, namely:—

"13B. Labour Inspector (Central) Jabalpur."

[No. F. 1/59/63-LR.I.]

OFDER

New Delhi, the 16th December 1963

S.O. 3526.—Whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Sendra Colliery of Messrs. Hind Shippers Private Limited, Post Office Bansjora (District Dhanbad) and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

Whether the dismissal of Shri Firu Bhuria, Underground Munshi, by the management of Sendra Colliery was justified? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

[No. 2/70/63-LR.II.]

A. L. HANNA, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 12th December 1963

S.O. 3527.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13 of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri V. A. Lakshmi pathy to be Inspector for the whole of the State of Mysore for the purposes of the said Act or of any Scheme framed thereunder, in relation to any establishment belonging to, or under the control of the Central Government, or in relation to an establishment connected with a railway company, a mine or an oil field or a controlled industry.

[No. 20(61)/63-PF.I.]

New Delhi, the 16th December 1963

S.O. 3528.—In pursuance of Clause (c) of Sub-paragraph (1) of paragraph 4 of the Employees' Provident Funds Scheme, 1952, the Central Government hereby nominates Shri D. P. Ketkar, as a member of the Regional Committee for the State of Maharashtra in the vacancy caused by the resignation of Shri Surendra M. Mehta, and makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.O. 1286, dated the 27th May, 1961, namely:—

In the said notification in the entries relating to item 5, for the words "Shri Surendra M. Mehta, Vice Chairman", the words "Shri D. P. Ketkar, Labour Officer", shall be substituted.

[No. 12(1)/63-PF.II.]

SHAH AZIZ AHMAD, Dy. Secy.

New Delhi, the 16th December 1963

S.O. 3529.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5 of the Mines Act, 1952 (35 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints, with effect from the 16th December, 1963, Shri G. S. Jabbri to be the Chief Inspector of Mines for all the territories to which the said Act extends.

2. The Notification of the Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Employment, No. S.O. 3200, dated the 8th November, 1963, is hereby cancelled with effect from the 16th December, 1963.

[No. 8/61/63-ML.]

R. C. SAKSENA, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 16th December 1963

S.O. 3530.—The following draft of a scheme further to amend the Vizagapatam Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1959, which the Central Government proposes to make in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), is published as required by the said sub-section for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby; and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken into consideration on or after the 15th January, 1964.

Any objections or suggestions which may be received from any person with respect to the said draft before the date so specified will be taken into consideration by the Central Government.

DRAFT SCHEME

1. This Scheme may be called the Vizagapatam Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Amendment Scheme, 1963.

2. In the Vizagapatam Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1959, in sub-clause (2) of clause 7, the following words shall be inserted at the end, namely:—

“nor prevent the incurring of expenditure on welfare measures, if any, for the staff of the Board.”

[No. 525/3/62-Fac. I.]

S.O. 3531.—The following draft of a scheme further to amend the Calcutta Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1956, which the Central Government proposes to make in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), is published as required by the said sub-section for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby, and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken into consideration on or after the 15th January, 1964.

Any objections or suggestions which may be received from any person with respect to the said draft before the date so specified will be taken into consideration by the Central Government.

DRAFT SCHEME

1. This Scheme may be called the Calcutta Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Amendment Scheme, 1963.

2. In the Calcutta Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1956, in sub-clause (2) of clause 7, the following words shall be inserted at the end, namely:—

“nor prevent the incurring of expenditure on welfare measures, if any, for the staff of the Board.”

[No. 525/3/62-Fac. II.]

S.O. 3532.—The following draft of a scheme further to amend the Cochin Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1959, which the Central Government proposes to make in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), is published as required by the said sub-section for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby; and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken into consideration on or after the 15th January, 1964.

Any objections or suggestions which may be received from any person with respect to the said draft before the date so specified will be taken into consideration by the Central Government.

DRAFT SCHEME

1. This Scheme may be called the Cochin Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Amendment Scheme, 1963.

2. In the Cochin Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1959, in sub-clause (2) of clause 7, the following words shall be inserted at the end, namely:—

“nor prevent the incurring of expenditure on welfare measures, if any, for the staff of the Board.”

[No. 525/3/62-Fac. III.]

S.O. 3533.—The following draft of a scheme further to amend the Bombay Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1956, which the Central Government proposes to make in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), is published as required by the said sub-section for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby; and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken into consideration on or after the 15th January, 1964.

Any objections or suggestions which may be received from any person with respect to the said draft before the date so specified will be taken into consideration by the Central Government.

DRAFT SCHEME

1. This Scheme may be called the Bombay Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Amendment Scheme, 1963.

2. In the Bombay Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1956, in sub-clause (2) of clause 7, the following words shall be inserted at the end, namely:—

“nor prevent the incurring of expenditure on welfare measures, if any, for the staff of the Board.”

[No. 525/3/62-Fac. IV.]

K. D. HAJELA, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY

New Delhi, the 12th December, 1963.

S.O. 3534.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 72 of the Indian Patents and Designs Act, 1911 (2 of 1911), the Central Government hereby appoints the Director, Indian Institute of Technology, Powai, Bombay-76 as an authority for the purpose of the said section and makes the following further amendment in the Notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Commerce and Industry No. S.R.O. 681, dated the 23rd March, 1955, namely:—

In the said Notification after item 27 and the entry relating thereto the following item and entry shall be substituted namely:—

“(28).—The Director, Indian Institute of Technology, Powai, Bombay”.

[No. 16(23)-TMP/63.]

HARGUNDAS, Under Secy.

ORDERS

New Delhi, the 10th December 1963

S.O. 3535.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 5 of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 (65 of 1951) read with rule 4 of the Central Advisory Council (Procedural) Rules, 1952, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri K. B. Mathur and Shri M. S. Rao, to be members, till the 4th July, 1965, of the Central Advisory Council of Industries established by the order of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Commerce and Industry No. S.O. 1932 dated the 5th July, 1963, and directs that the following amendment shall be made in the said Order, namely:—

In the said Order, after entry No. 26A relating to Shri Prabhu V. Mehta, the following entries shall be added, namely:—

“27. Shri K. B. Mathur, Chairman, Heavy Electricals (India) Ltd., 5, Parliament Street, New Delhi.	“Producers”	“Member”
28. Shri M. S. Rao, Chairman, Hindustan Steel Ltd., 10, Parliament Street, New Delhi.	“Producers”	“Member”

[No. 1(2)Lic. Pol./63.]

New Delhi, the 12th December 1963

S.O. 3536/IDRA/6/3.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 6 of the Industries (Development & Regulation) Act, 1951 (65 of 1951) read with Rule 5(1) of the Development Councils (Procedural) Rules, 1952, the Central Government hereby appoints, till the 27th August, 1965, Shri K. K. Bhasin, to be a member of the Development Council established by the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Industry No. S.O. 2531 dated the 28th August, 1963, for the scheduled industries engaged in the manufacture or production of Non-Ferrous Metals, including Alloys and Semi-manufactures thereof and directs that the following amendment shall be made in the said Order, namely:

In the said Order, after entry No. 27 relating to Shri R. I. L. Chisholm, the following entry shall be inserted, namely:—

28. Shri K. K. Bhasin,
The Aluminium Corporation of India Ltd.,
7, Council House Street,
Calcutta.

[No. 1(7)/L.Pr./63.]

S.O. 3537/IDRA/6/16.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 6 of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 (65 of 1951) read with Rules 5(1) and 8 of the Development Councils (Procedural) Rules, 1952, the Central Government hereby appoints, till the 8th September, 1965, Shri H. D. S. Hardie, to be a member of the Development Council established by the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Industry No. S.O. 2625, dated the 9th September, 1963, for the scheduled industries engaged in the manufacture or production of Automobiles, Automobile Ancillary Industries, Transport Vehicle Industries, Tractors and Earth Moving Equipment and directs that the following amendment shall be made in the said Order, namely:

In the said Order, for entry No. 9 relating to Shri K. R. Goodwin, the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

9. Shri H. D. S. Hardie,
M/s. Asbestos, Magnesia & Friction Materials Ltd.,
Ghatkopar, Bombay-77.

[No. 1(3)/L.Pr./63.]

S. P. KRISHNAMURTHY, Under Secy.

(Indian Standards Institution)

New Delhi the 6th December 1963

S.O. 3538—In pursuance of sub-regulation (1) of regulation 8 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, as amended in 1961 and 1962, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that twenty-eight licences, particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been renewed.

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licence No. and Date	Period of Validity		Name and Address of the Licensee	Article(s) covered by the licence	Relevant Indian Standard(s)	
		From (2)	To (3)				
1	CM/L-34 4-II-1957	.	16-II-63	15-II-64	The National Insulated Cable Co. of India Ltd., 67, Stephen House, 4 Dalhousie Square, Calcutta-I.	Hard-Drawn Copper Solid and Stranded Conductors.	IS: 282-1963 Specification for Hard-Drawn Copper Conductors for Overhead Power Transmission. (Revised).
2	CM L-35 4-II-1957	.	16-II-63	15-II-64	The National Insulated Cable Co. of India Ltd., 67, Stephen House, 4 Dalhousie Square, Calcutta-I.	Bare Annealed Copper Wire.	IS: 396-1953 Specification for Bare Annealed High-Conductivity Copper Wire for Electrical Machinery and Apparatus (Tentative).
3	CM/L-36 4-II-1957	.	16-II-63	15-II-64	The National Insulated Cable Co. of India Ltd., 67, Stephen House, 4 Dalhousie Square, Calcutta-I.	Hard-Drawn Stranded Aluminium and Steel Cored Aluminium Conductors for Overhead Power Transmission Purposes.	IS: 398-1961 Specification for Hard-Drawn Stranded Aluminium and Steel-Cored Aluminium Conductors for Overhead Power Transmission Purposes (Revised).
4	CM/L-37 4-II-1957	.	16-II-63	15-II-64	The National Insulated Cable Co. of India Ltd., 67, Stephen House, 4 Dalhousie Square, Calcutta-I.	Rubber-Insulated Cables and Flexible Cords for Electric Power and Lighting (for Working Voltages Up to and Including 11 kV).	IS: 434-1953 Specification for Rubber-Insulated Cables and Flexible Cords for Electric Power and Lighting (for Working Voltages Up to and Including 11 kV). (Tentative).
5	CM/L-38 4-II-1957	.	16-II-63	15-II-64	The National Insulated Cable Co. of India Ltd., 67, Stephen House, 4 Dalhousie Square, Calcutta-I.	Cotton-Covered High-Conductivity Annealed Round Copper Wire.	IS: 450-1953 Specification for Cotton-Covered High-Conductivity Annealed Round Copper Wire.
6	CM/L-39 4-II-1958	.	16-II-63	15-II-64	M/s. Rashtriya Metal Industries Limited, Kurla Road, Andheri (East), Bombay-41.	Wrought Aluminium and Aluminium Alloy Utensils.	IS: 21-1959 Specification for Wrought Aluminium and Aluminium Alloy for Utensils. (Second Revision).

7	CM/L-46 4-II-1958	16-II-63	15-II-64	M/s. Rashtriya Metal Industries Limited, Kurla Road, Andheri (East), Bombay-41.	Wrought Aluminium and Aluminium Alloy Sheets, Strips and Circles.	IS: 21-1959 Specification for Wrought Aluminium and Aluminium Alloy for Utensils (Second Revision).
8	CM/L-105 31-10-1958	17-II-63	16-II-64	M/s. Sylvan Plywood Mills, Kottayam, Kerala.	Tea-Chest Plywood Panels.	IS: 10-1953 Specification for Plywood Tea-Chests (Revised).
9	CM/L-106 4-II-1958	17-II-63	16-II-64	M/s. Mysore Chemical Manufacturers Ltd., Chikbanavar P.O., Bangalore Distt.	Copper Sulphate, Technical.	IS: 261-1950 Specification for Copper Sulphate, Technical.
10	CM/L-107 4-II-1958	17-II-63	16-II-64	The Assam Veneer & Saw Mills Ltd., 9, Clive Row, Calcutta-1.	Tea-Chest Plywood Panels.	IS: 10-1953 Specification for Plywood Tea-Chests (Revised).
11	CM/L-109 4-II-1958	17-II-63	16-II-64	M/s. Savlar Paint & Varnish Works, Vihar Lake Road, Saki Naka, Kurla, Bombay-37.	i) Oil Paste for Paints, Zinc Oxide. ii) Oil Paste for Paints, Zinc Oxide, Reduced.	IS: 98-1950 Specification for Oil Paste for Paints, Zinc Oxide. IS: 99-1950 Specification for Oil Paste for Paints, Zinc Oxide, Reduced.
12	CM/L-123 21-5-1959	1-12-63	30-II-64	M/s. Purushotham Goculdas Plywood Co., Pappinisseri (Kerala State).	Tea-Chest Plywood Panels.	IS: 10-1953 Specification for Plywood Tea-Chests (Revised).
13	CM/L-217 31-8-1960	10-II-63	9-II-64	M/s. Tata Fusion Ltd., 20 Howrah Road, Salkia, Calcutta.	DDT Water Dispersible Powder Concentrates.	IS: 565-1961 Specification for DDT Water Dispersible Powder Concentrates (Revised).
14	CM/L-240 28-10-1960	15-II-63	14-II-64	M/s. Research Chemical Laboratories, Lattice Bridge Road, Adayar, Madras-20.	Dye-Based Fountain Pen Inks, Blue, Green, Violet and Red	IS: 1221-1957 Specification for Dye-Based Fountain Pen Inks (Blue, Green, Violet, Black and Red).
15	CM/L-243 23-II-1960	1-II-63	30-II-64	M/s. Hindustan Tin Works Private Ltd., G.T. Road, Ghaziabad.	18 Litre Square Tins.	IS: 916-1958 Specification for 18-Litre Square Tins.
16	CM/L-294 28-4-1961	20-II-63	19-II-64	M/s. Devidayal (Sales) Pvt. Ltd., Gupta Mills Estate, Reay Road, Darukhana, Bombay-10.	Endrin Emulsifiable Concentrates.	IS: 1310-1958 Specification for Endrin Emulsifiable Concentrates.
17	CM/L-302 25-5-1961	1-II-63	30-II-64	M/s. National Plywood Industries, 6, Gorapada Sarkar Lane, Calcutta-4.	Tea-Chest Plywood Panels.	IS: 10-1953 Specification for Plywood Tea-Chests (Revised).
18	CM/L-351 31-10-1961	17-II-63	16-II-64	M/s. Bharat Wood Works Private Ltd., P.O. Dibrugarh, Assam.	Tea-Chest Plywood Panels.	IS: 10-1953 Specification for Plywood Tea-Chest (Revised).
19	CM/L-352 21-10-1961	15-II-63	14-II-64	Messrs Devidayal Cable Industries Private Ltd., Gupta Mills Estate, Darukhana, Reay Road, Bombay-10.	PVC Cables, 250 and 650 Volts Grade.	IS: 694-1960 Specification for PVC Cables and Cords for Electric Power and Lighting for working Voltages Up to and Including 650 Volts to Earth.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	
20	CM/L-358 20-11-1961	.	1-12-63	30-11-64	M/s. Indian Traders Private Limited, Industrial Area, Najafgarh Road, New Delhi-15.	Vulcanized Rubber-Insulated (VIR) Cables, TRS (Tough Rubber Sheathed) 250 Volts Grade, Taped/Untaped, Braided and Compounded 250 and 660 Volts Grade, and Weatherproof Cables of 250 and 660 Volts Grade.	IS: 434-1953 Specification for Rubber-Insulated Cables and Flexible Cords for Electric Power and Lighting (for Working Voltages upto and including 11kV).
21	CM/L-359 20-11-1961	.	1-12-63	30-11-64	M/s. Burmah-Shell Oil Storage & Distributing Co. of India Ltd., Burmah-Shell House, Ballard Estate, Bombay-1.	Dieldrin Emulsifiable Concentrates.	IS: 1054-1962 Specification for Dieldrin Emulsifiable Concentrates (Revised).
22	CM/L-464 24-10-1962	.	15-11-63	14-11-64	M/s. Geo Industries & Insecticides (India) Pvt. Ltd., Field No. 82/3(a) Sathankadu, Kalandapet, Madras-19.	BHC Water Dispersible Powder Concentrates.	IS: 562-1962 Specification for BHC Water Dispersible Powder Concentrates (Second Revision).
23	CM/L-466 30-10-1962	.	15-11-63	14-11-64	M/s. Sial Soap Stone Factory, Rupaudh (S.E.R.), P.O. Barwara, Via Katni, Distt. Jabalpur.	BHC Dusting Powders	IS: 561-1962 Specification for BHC Dusting Powders (Second Revision).
24	CM/L-467 30-10-1962	.	15-11-63	14-11-64	M/s. Shalimar Tar Products (1935) Limited, 26, Lake Road, Bhandup, Bombay-78 having their office at 6, Lyons Range, Calcutta.	Bitumen Felts for Water-proofing and Damp-Proofing Type 3, Grade I.	IS: 1322-1959 Specification for Bitumen Felts for Water-proofing and Damp-Proofing.
25	CM/L-468 30-10-1962	.	15-11-63	14-11-64	M/s. Prabhat Udyog Ltd., Prabhat Udyog Nagar, Ghodbunder Road, Jogeshwari, Bombay-60 having their office at Noble Chambers, Parsi Bazar Street, Fort, Bombay-1.	Oil Pressure Lanterns.	IS: 1384-1959 Specification for Oil Pressure Lanterns.
26	CM/L-471 2-11-1962	.	15-11-63	14-11-64	M/s. Prabhat Udyog Ltd., Prabhat Udyog Nagar, Ghodbunder Road, Jogeshwari, Bombay-60 having their office at Noble Chambers, Parsi Bazar Street, Fort, Bombay-1.	Blow Lamps.	IS: 1899-1961 Specification for Blow Lamps.
27	CM/L-472 16-11-1962	.	1-12-63	30-11-64	M/s. Bharat Sheet Metal Industries Ltd., 22, Beerpura Lane, Ghugudanga, Dum Dum, Calcutta.	Steel Drums.	IS: 1549-1960 Specification for Steel Drums and Kegs (Galvanized and Ungalvanized).

28 CM/L-473
20-II-1962

1-12-63

30-II-64

M/s. Chandra Electricals, S 2/638 AC and Universal Fractional
Club Road, Varanasi Cantt.

Horse Power Motors 1/36 to 1
Horse Power.

IS: 996-1959 Specification for
small AC and Universal Elec-
tric Motors with Class 'A'
Insulation.

[No. MD/12: 105]

S. O. 3539—In pursuance of sub-regulation (1) of regulation 8 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, as amended in 1961 and 1992, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that nine licences, particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been granted authorizing the licencees to use the Standard Mark.

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licence No. and Date	Period of Validity		Name and Address of the Licensee	Article/Process Covered by the Licensee	Relevant Indian Standard
		From 3	To 4			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	CM/L-598 7-II-1963	1-12-63	30-II-64	M/s. Skytone Electricals (India), 43, Industrial Area, Farida- bad having their Head Office at 2655, Sadar Thana Road, Delhi—6.	i) PVC Cables with Copper Conductors only, 250 and 650 Volts Grade. ii) PVC Insulated Flexible Cords with Copper Conduc- tors only, 250 Volts Grade. Parallel Kegs (Size 12 8 80 mm and 18 11 100 mm only).	IS : 694-1960 Specification for PVC Cables and Cords for Electric Power and Lighting for Working Vol- tages upto and including 650 Volts to Earth (<i>Tentative,</i> <i>Amended</i>). IS : 2048-1962 Specification for Parallel Kegs and Keyways.
2	CM/L-599 7-II-1963	15-12-63	14-12-64	M/s. Gadre Brothers, Raviwar Peth, Madhavnagar—S. Rail- way, District Sangli, Ma- harashtra State.	Bicycle Chains . . .	IS : 627-1961 Specification for Bicycle Chains (<i>Revised</i>).
3	CM/L-600 20-II-1963	15-12-63	14-12-64	M/s. Central Distributors Ltd., Poisar Bridge, Kandivli, Bom- bay—67.	14 SWG Bicycle Spokes (Plain) with Nipples and Washers.	IS : 630-1961 Specification for Bicyc Spokes (Plain) and Nipples for Spokes (<i>Revised</i>).
4	CM/L-601 20-II-1963	15-12-63	14-12-64	M/s. Central Distributors Ltd., Poisar Bridge, Kandivli, Bom- bay—67.	Cotton Drills for Colour Fast- ness only, Shades No. 3, 21 and 29.	IS : 177-1951 Specification for Cotton Drills (<i>Tentative</i>).
5	CM/L-602 28-II-1963	1-1-64	31-12-64	The Svadeshi Mills Company Ltd., Kurla, Bombay—70.	Cotton Poplins for Colour Fast- ness only, Shades No. 2, 26, 32, 34 and 35.	IS : 188-1951 Specification for Cotton Poplins (<i>Tentative</i>).
6	CM/L-603 28-II-1963	1-1-64	31-12-64	The Svadeshi Mills Company Ltd., Kurla, Bombay—70.	Footballs and Volley balls.	IS : 417-1951 Specification for Footballs, Volley-balls, Basket-balls and Water- Polo Balls (<i>Tentative</i>).
7	CM/L-604 29-II-1963	1-1-64	31-12-64	M/s. Kashmir Sports Industries, 135 Bhagat Singh Market, New Delhi.	Rubber-Insulated Cables with Copper Conductors, TRS, Tough Rubber Sheathed 250	IS : 434-1953 Specification for Rubber-Insulated Cables and Flexible Cords for Electric
8	CM/L-605 29-II-1963	1-1-64	31-12-64	M/s. Skytone Electricals India 43-Industrial Area, Farida- bad having their Head Office		

at 2655-Sadar Thana Road,
Delhi-6.

and 660 Volts Grade ; VIR,
Taped/Untaped, Braided
and Compounded, including
Weatherproof Cables of 250
and 660 Volts Grade and
VIR Flexible Cords, 250
Volts Grade.

Power and Lighting (For Work-
ing Voltages up to and
including 11 KV (Tentative).

9 CM/L-606
29-II-1963

1-1-64 31-12-64 M/s. Associated Pigments Li-
mited, 260, Barrackpore
Trunk Road, P. O. Sukchar,
24 Parganas, West Bengal,
having their Office at 14,
Netaji Subhas Road, Cal-
cutta-I.

Zinc Oxide for Paints.

IS : 35-1950 Specification for
Zinc Oxide for Paints.

[No. MD/12:1032]

New Delhi, the 11th December 1963

S.O. 3540.—In partial modification of the Standard Mark, notified in the Schedule annexed to the then Ministry of Commerce and Industry (Indian Standards Institution) Notification No. S.O. 1327 dated the 30th April 1963 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-Section (ii), dated the 11th May 1963, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the Standard Mark for Structural Steel (Fusion Welding Quality) design of which together with the verbal description of the design and the title of the relevant Indian Standard is given in the Schedule hereto annexed, has been revised.

This Standard Mark for the purpose of Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Act, 1952, as amended in 1961 and the Rules and Regulations framed thereunder, shall come into force with immediate effect.

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Design of the Standard Mark	Product/Class of Products	No. and Title of the Relevant Indian Standard	Verbal description of the design of the Standard Mark
		Structural Steel (Fusion Welding quality)	IS : 2062-1962 Specification for Structural Steel (Fusion Welding Quality)	The monogram of the Indian Standards Institution consisting of letters ISI, drawn in the exact style and relative proportions as indicated in col. (2), the number designation of the Indian Standard being superscribed on the top side of the monogram as indicated in the design.

[No. MD/17:2]

S.O. 3541.—In partial modification of the Standard Mark, notified in the Schedule annexed to the then Ministry of Commerce and Industry (Indian Standards Institution) Notification No. S.O. 909 dated the 19th March 1962 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-Section (ii), dated the 31st March 1963 the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the Standard Marks for Various Products, designs of which together with the verbal description of the designs and the titles of the relevant Indian Standards are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been revised.

These Standard Marks for the purpose of Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Act, 1952, as amended in 1961 and the Rules and Regulations framed thereunder, shall come into force with immediate effect.

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Design of the Standard Mark	Product/ Class of Products	No. and Title of the Relevant Indian Standard	Verbal description of the design of the Standard Mark
		Structural Steel	IS : 226-1962 Specification for Structural Steel (Third Revision)	The monogram of the Indian Standards Institution consisting of letters ISI drawn in the exact style and relative proportions as indicated in col. (2), the number designation of the Indian Standard being superscribed on the top side of the monogram as indicated in the design.

Sl. No.	Design of the Standard Mark	Product/Class of Products	No. and Title of the Relevant Indian Standard	Verbal description of the design of the Standard Mark
IS: 432		Mild Steel and Medium Tensile Steel Bars and Hard-Drawn Steel Wire for Concrete reinforcement	IS : 432-1960 Specification for Mild Steel and Medium Tensile Steel Bars and Hard-Drawn Steel Wire for Concrete reinforcement (Revised)	The monogram of the Indian Standards Institution consisting of letters ISI drawn in the exact style and relative proportions as indicated in col. (2), the number designation of the Indian Standard being superscribed on the top side of the monogram as indicated in the design.
IS: 961		High Tensile Structural Steel	IS : 961-1962 Specification for High Tensile Structural Steel (Revised)	The monogram of the Indian Standards Institution consisting of letters ISI drawn in the exact style and relative proportion as indicated in the design, the number designation of the Indian Standard being superscribed on the top side of the monogram as indicated in the design.

[No. MD/17:2]

New Delhi, the 12th December 1963

S.O. 3542.—In pursuance of sub-rule (1) of rule 4 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Rules, 1955, as amended in 1962, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the Standard Mark design of which together with the verbal description of the design and the title of the relevant Indian Standard is given in the Schedule hereto annexed, has been specified.

This Standard Mark, for the purpose of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Act, 1952, as amended in 1961, and the rules and regulations framed thereunder, shall come into force with effect from 1 January 1964.

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Design of the Standard Mark	Product/Class of Products to which applicable	No. & Title of Relevant Indian Standard	Verbal description of the design of the Standard Mark
1	2	3	4	5
IS: 35		Zinc Oxide for Paints	IS:35-1950 Specification for Zinc Oxide for Paints	The monogram of the Indian Standards Institution consisting of letters ISI, drawn in the exact style and relative proportions as indicated in col. (2), the number designation of the Indian Standard being superscribed on the top side of the monogram as indicated in the design.

[No. MD/17:2]

S.O. 3543.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (3) of regulation 7 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, as amended in 1961 and 1962, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the marking fees per unit for Cotton Drills and Cotton Poplins details of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been determined and the fees shall come into force with effect from 1 January 1964.

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Product/Class of Products	No. and Title of relevant Indian Standard	Unit	Marking Fee per Unit
1	2	3	4	5
1	Cotton Drills	IS:177-1951 Specification for Cotton Drills (Tentative).	5 Metres	1 nP. per unit with a minimum of Rs. 2,500.00 for production during a calendar year.
2	Cotton Poplins	IS:188-1951 Specification for Cotton Poplins (Tentative)	5 Metres	1 nP. per unit for the first 1,000,000 units, 0.5 nP. for every unit thereafter with a minimum of Rs. 2,500.00 for production during a calendar year.

[No. MD/18 : 2]

S.O. 3544.—In partial modification of the then Ministry of Commerce and Industry (Indian Standards Institution) notification published under S.O. 2345 dated the 4th November 1958 in the *Gazette of India* Part II, Section 3, Sub-Section (ii) dated the 15th November, 1958, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the marking fee per unit for various products details of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been revised. The revised rate of marking fee shall come into force with effect from 18 November, 1963.

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Product/Class of Product	No. and Title of Relevant Indian Standard	Unit	Marking Fee per Unit
1	2	3	4	5
1	Oil Paste for Paints, Zinc Oxide.	IS:98-1950 Specification for Oil Paste for Paints, Zinc Oxide.	One Metric Tonne	Rs. 5.00
2	Oil Paste for Paints, Zinc Oxide, Reduced	IS:99-1950 Specification for Oil Paste for Paints, Zinc Oxide, Reduced.	One Metric Tonne	Rs. 5.00

[No. MD/18 : 2]

S.O. 3545.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (3) of regulation 7 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, as amended in 1961 and 1962, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the marking fee per unit for various products details of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been determined and the fee shall come into force with effect from 1 January 1964.

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Product/Class of Products	No. and Title of relevant Indian Standard	Unit	Marking Fee per unit
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Zinc Oxide for Paints	IS:35-1950 Specification for Zinc Oxide for Paints.	One Metric Tonne	Rs. 3.00 per unit for the first 500 units Rs. 2.00 per unit for the 501st unit and above with a minimum of Rs. 1,000.00 for production during a calendar year.
2.	Footballs, Volley-balls, Basket-balls and Water Polo Balls.	IS:417-1953 Specification for Footballs, Volley-balls, Basket-balls and Water Polo Balls (<i>Tentative</i>).	One Piece	5 nP. per unit with a minimum of Rs. 250.00 for production during a calendar year.

[No. M1/18 : 2]

S.O. 3546.—In pursuance of sub-rule (1) of rule 4 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Rules, 1955, as amended in 1962, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the Standard Mark(s), design(s) of which together with the verbal description of the design(s) and the title(s) of the relevant Indian Standard(s) are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been specified.

These Standard Mark(s), for the purpose of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Act, 1952, as amended in 1961, and the rules and regulations framed thereunder, shall come into force with effect from 1 January 1964.

THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Design of the Standard Mark	Product/Class of Products to which applicable	No. & Title of relevant Indian Standard	Verbal description of the design of the Standard Mark
1	2	3	4	5
1.	IS:177  COLOUR FASTNESS ONLY	Cotton Drills	IS:177-1951 Specification for Cotton Drills (<i>Tentative</i>).	The monogram of the Indian Standards Institution consisting of letters ISI, drawn in the exact style and relative proportions as indicated in col. (2), the number designation of the Indian Standard being superscribed on the top side of the monogram and the relevant requirement being subscribed under the bottom side of the monogram as indicated in the design.

1

2

3

4

5

2

IS:188



COLOUR FASTNESS ONLY

Cotton IS:188-1951 Spec-
Poplins ification for Cotton
Poplins (*Tentative*).

The monogram of the Indian Standards Institution consisting of letters ISI, drawn in the exact style and relative proportions as indicated in col. (2), the number designation of the Indian Standard being superscribed on the top side of the monogram and the relevant requirement being subscribed under the bottom side of the monogram as indicated in the design.

[No. MD/17:2]

S. K. SEN
Head of the Certification Marks Department.